This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

NATIONAL

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

EDWARD I. SEARS, A. M., LL. D.

DECEMBER, 1864, AND MARCH, 1865.

VOL. X.

"Pulchrum est bene facere reipublicæ, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est."

NEW YORK:

EDWARD I. SEARS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

1865.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by
E. I. SEARS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Southern District of New York.

CONTENTS OF NO. XIX.

ART. PAGE.

I. PERICLES AND HIS TIMES 1
1. *Vita Periclis ex ipsis fontibus, maxime Plutarcho, petita.*
2. *Disputatio historico-literaria de Pericle ejusque reipublicæ Atheniensium administratione.* CLARISSE.
3. *The Life of Pericles.* By PLUTARCH.
4. *History of Greece.* By GROTE.
5. *Pericles der Olympier, biographische Darstellung.* KUFFNER.
6. *The History of the Peloponnesian War.* By THUCYDIDES.
7. *Économie politique des Athéniens.* Par M. BOECKH.

II. THE CIVILIZING FORCES 88
1. *History of Civilization in Europe.* By M. GUIZOT.
2. *History of Civilization in England.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE.
3. *The Man of the North and the Man of the South.* By CHARLES VICTOR DE BONSTILLEN.

III. CHIEF-JUSTICE TANEY 50
1. *Reports of the Supreme Court, and other Public Documents, &c.*

IV. SPANISH LITERATURE: LOPE DE VEGA 71
1. *Fama Posthuma a la vida y muerte del doctor Frey Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* Por MONTALVAN.
2. *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova.* Por NICOLAS ANTONIO.
3. *Notice sur Lope de Vega in tête de sa traduction.* Par M. LA BEAUMELLE.
4. *Some account of the Life and Writings of Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* By HENRY RICHARD, LORD HOLLAND.
5. *Planto funebre en la muerte de Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* Por LARRAMENDI.
6. *History of Spanish Literature.* By GEORGE TICKNOR.

V. CURRENCY—CAUSES OF DEPRECIATION 109
1. *Acts of Congress and other Public Documents.*

VI. LEO X. AND HIS TIMES 122
1. *Life and Pontificate of Leo X.* By WM. ROSCOE.
2. *Literature of the South of Europe.* By SISMONDI.
3. *History of Italy.* By GUICCIARDINI.
4. *Historical Dictionary.* By BAYLE.

ART. PAGE.
VII. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS BY SPECTRAL OBSERVATIONS 143
1. *Philosophical Magazine.* Ed. by A. TILLOCH.
2. *London and Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science.* Ed. by SIR D. BREWSTER.
3. *London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science.* Ed. by KANE AND FRANCIS.
4. *Denkschriften der Königlichen Academie der Wissenschaften zu München für die Jahre* 1814, 1815.
5. *Abstracts of the Papers printed in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London.*
6. *L'Institut, Journal Universel des Sciences, &c.*
7. *Annales de Chemie.*
8. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie* Von J. G. POGGENDORFF.

VIII. THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE 158

IX. NOTICES AND CRITICISMS 169
History and Travels 169
Fiction 175
Belles-Lettres 180
Lexicography 195
Miscellaneous 199

CONTENTS OF NO. XX.

ART. PAGE.

I. ITALIAN POETRY: ARIOSTO..... 207
1. *Orlando Furioso* di Messer LODOVICO ARIOSTO.
2. *The Orlando Furioso, Translated into English Verse; from the Italian of* LUDOVICO ARIOSTO, *with notes.* By WILLIAM STEWART ROSE.
3. *Opere Minori in Verso e in Prosa* di LODOVICO ARIOSTO, *ordinate e annotate.* Per CURA DI FILIPPO LUIGI POLIDORI.

II. LUNAR PHENOMENA..... 245
1. *Théorie de la Lune, deduite de seul principe de l'attraction.* Par M. CLAIRANT.
2. *The Principia.* By SIR ISAAC NEWTON.
3. *Selenotopographische Fragmente zur genauern Kenntniss der Mondflaeche, &c.* Von J. H. SCHROETER.
4. *Fundamenta nova Investigationis orbitæ veræ quam luna perlustrat, &c.* P. A. HANSEN.
5. *Théorie du Mouvement de la Lune.* Par T. MAYER.
6. *Cosmos; a Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe.* By ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT.

III. GRAHAME OF CLAVERHOUSE AND THE COVENANTERS..... 225
Memorials and Letters Illustrative of the Life and Times of John Grahame of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. By MARK NAPIER.

IV. OUR GAS MONOPOLIES..... 278
Communication from the Comptroller to the Common Council, January 16, 1865, relative to Gas Contracts.

V. EDWARD EVERETT..... 293
1. *Defence of Christianity.* By EDWARD EVERETT.
2. *Speeches and Addresses.* By EDWARD EVERETT.
3. *Congressional Debates*, 1826–27.
4. *Congressional Globe*, 1833—1835.
5. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, 1841—1845.
6. *Executive Documents*, 182—183.
7. *North American Review*, 1820—1865.
8. *Speech in Faneuil Hall.* By EDWARD EVERETT, 9th January, 1865.

VI. MACHIAVELLI AND HIS MAXIMS OF GOVERNMENT..... 311
1. *Opera di Nicolo Machiavelli, Cittadino e Segretario Fiorentino.*
2. *The History of Florence and of the Affairs of Italy from the earliest times to the Death of Lorenzo the Magnificent, together with The Prince, and various Historical Tracts.* By NICOLO MACHIAVELLI.
3. *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtschreiber.*

PAGE.

VII. HISTORY, USES, AND ABUSES OF PETROLEUM 336
Prospectuses and Pamphlets of various Petroleum Companies, New York and Philadelphia.

VIII. SWEDENBORG AND HIS NEW RELIGION 349
1. *Opera Omnia.* EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.
2. *The Complete Works of* EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

IX. NOTICES AND CRITICISMS 360
History and Education 360
Belles-Lettres 381
Ethics and Religion 392
Miscellaneous 396

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XIX.

DECEMBER, 1864.

ART. I.—1. *Vita Periclis* ex ipsis fontibus, maxime Plutarcho, petita. Utrect, 1835.

2. *Disputatio historico-literaria de Pericle ejusque reipublicæ Atheniensium administratione.* CLARISSE. Leyde, 1837.

3. *The Life of Pericles.* By PLUTARCH.

4. *History of Greece.* By GROTE. Vols. v. vi.

5. *Pericles der Olympier, biographische Darstellung.* KUFFNER. Vienna, 1809.

6. *The History of the Peloponnesian War.* By THUCYDIDES.

7. *Économie politique des Athéniens.* Par M. BOECKH.

THE ancient Greeks were undoubtedly a wonderful people. The more we study their history the more astonishing it seems; indeed, were it less fully attested than it is, it would be difficult to believe that it is not fabulous. Nor need we explain why. A hundred reasons will readily suggest themselves to every intelligent reader. It will be sufficient for our present purpose to remember that there is no intellectual effort, of which the human mind is capable, in which the Greeks did not excel. This is the unanimous estimate of all nations. No one having any pretensions to taste or culture would venture to deny that poetry, philosophy, oratory, statesmanship, history, the drama, and the fine arts attained their highest perfection in Greece. Those who have excelled in these various departments, and whom,

for nearly three thousand years, the world has regarded as models for imitation, are so familiar to every cultivated mind that it is almost superfluous to mention their names.

It matters little in what enlightened country it is asked, Where are we to seek the greatest poet, the greatest orator, the greatest reasoner, in short the highest order of human intellect? The Greeks whose works have reached us cannot be forgotten; their fame is more imperishable than any monument ever raised by the hand of man. But there are those, of whose productions we have no specimens, whom we know only by the reports of others that are scarcely less illustrious, or that have less claim on our admiration and gratitude, than the great authors who are an inexhaustible source of instruction and delight to millions; men, for example, like Socrates, Anaxagoras, Pericles, &c.

It is not strange that geniuses of the latter class receive less attention than those of the former, since it is much easier to examine the life and character of those whose works we possess than those of persons whose renown among their contemporaries is all pertaining to them that has reached us. But we turn our attention to them all the more readily on this account; for we hold that it is the duty of a periodical writer, if not indeed of every writer, to entertain his readers rather with what they do not know, or have only a vague knowledge of, than with what is already comparatively familiar to them. And since Greece presents us representative men in every department that has ever exercised the human intellect, what can be more appropriate at the present crisis than to select for discussion the life and character of her greatest statesman? We do not, indeed, mean to draw any parallel between Pericles and any ruler or public official we know at the present day; we should as soon think of drawing a parallel between Homer and one of our fourth-rate poets, when we did not feel disposed, as we do not now, to mock at the latter and exhibit him to public scorn. What we undertake on the present occasion is, to show what Pericles was, what he did, what means he used to accomplish his objects, and what was the secret of his power. We take up the subject all the more cheerfully because we think it is one which could not be discussed, however imperfectly, without deducing from it some useful lessons.

Pericles belonged to one of the first families in Athens. His father, Xanthippus, defeated the King of Persia's best generals, and was as much esteemed for his integrity as he

was renowned for his valor and patriotism. Nor was his father-in-law, Clisthenes, less celebrated, for it was he who expelled the family of Pisistratus the tyrant, and established a form of government which was famous throughout Greece for its wisdom and liberality. The most illustrious philosophers of his time were his instructors. His preceptor in the natural sciences was Anaxagoras; he received lessons on the harp from Damon; from Pythoclydes he received lessons on other instruments, and he attended the lectures of Zeno of Elea.* Each of these was at the head of his profession, and all acknowledged that they had no more brilliant pupil than Pericles. Nor have we any reason to think that they were unduly partial in their estimate; on the contrary, the testimony of Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, and Xenophon prove the contrary, and be it remembered that all these illustrious thinkers were his contemporaries.

We have evidence of his wisdom and sagacity in a thousand forms. It seems that anterior to his time the Athenians regarded eclipses as indications of the Divine displeasure. There were, indeed, philosophers who knew better; but they knew also how dangerous it was to put forward views which conflicted with the tenets of the popular religion, while the people had all power in their own hands. Thus it was that Anaxagoras taught Pericles that not only eclipses, but all other phenomena which were wont to create terror, were the results of natural causes; whereas, had he made the same statements directly to the people, it was more than probable that he would have had to pay the penalty with his life.

Even Pericles, unbounded as was his influence over the masses, found it necessary to wait for a suitable opportunity before he attempted to question the truth of their faith. The best he could have desired for this purpose occurred at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. Plutarch tells us that he manned a hundred and fifty ships, on which he embarked great numbers of select horse and foot, and was preparing to set sail. The Athenians conceived good hopes, and the enemy no less dreaded so great an armament. The whole fleet was in readiness, and Pericles on board of his own galley, when there appeared an eclipse of the sun. The

* The Zeno alluded to here is not the founder of the sect of stoics, but quite as great a philosopher, and probably a greater man. He it was who sacrificed his life in the cause of liberty, by attempting to rid the world of a tyrant—Periander of Corinth—who caused him to be pounded to death in a mortar.

sudden darkness was looked upon as an unfavorable omen, and threw them into the greatest consternation. Pericles observing that the pilot was astonished and perplexed, took his cloak, and having covered his eyes with it, asked him, "If he found anything terrible in that, or considered it as a sad presage." Upon his answering in the negative, he added, "Where is the difference between this and the other, except that something bigger than a cloak causes the eclipse?" This simple explanation, because given at the proper time and place, had the desired effect.

Other superstitions of an equally serious character were disposed of in a manner not less simple or less effectual. One instance more will be sufficient for our present purpose. We are told that a ram's head with only one horn was brought to Pericles from one of his farms; those who took it regarding it as a fearful prognostic. They had Lampo the soothsayer immediately sent for. We are informed that when he saw that the horn grew thick and strong out of the middle of the forehead, he declared that the two parties in the state, namely, those of Thucydides and Pericles, would unite, and invest the whole power in him with whom the prodigy was found. Pericles had no faith in any such presage, but as it was made to apply to himself, he preferred to have it explained by another.*

All capable of judging had implicit confidence in the opinion of Anaxagoras, the naturalist and philosopher, who was accordingly called upon to examine the monster. His course was to dissect the head and show that the brain did not fill the whole cavity, but had contracted itself into an oval form, and pointed directly to that part of the skull whence the horn took its rise.

At first view it might not seem, even at the present day, that superstitions like those we have mentioned could be productive of much harm, but the intelligent student of history knows the reverse. Although the Greeks were beyond question the most enlightened people of their time, none suffered more from attributing natural phenomena to supernatural agency. As an example, we may mention what happened to the Athenian fleet in the harbor of Syracuse. It was ready

* The course subsequently pursued towards Pericles and his friends shows how dangerous it was to meddle with the prejudices or traditional faith of the people. Towards the close of his long, honorable, and active life, Diopithes procured a decree that *those who introduced new opinions about celestial appearances*, should be tried before an assembly of the people. This charge was levelled, as Plutarch tells us, first at Anaxagoras, and through him at Pericles.

to sail in order to retire, but General Nicias, the commander, seeing that the moon was eclipsed, resolved not to put to sea until it was over. This he thought a wise precaution, but it proved the ruin of his fleet. "Nicias and all the rest were struck with a great panic, either through ignorance or superstition," says Plutarch. "As for an eclipse of the sun, which happens at the conjunction, even the common people had some idea of its being caused by the interposition of the moon; but they could not easily form a conception by the interposition of what body the moon, when at the full, should suddenly lose her light and assume such a variety of colors. They looked upon it, therefore, as a strange and preternatural phenomenon—a sign by which the gods announced some great calamity."*

It may well seem strange, almost incredible, that an Athenian general in the time of Pericles should be prevented from setting sail by an eclipse of the moon; but be it remembered, that it was the people who conferred all public offices, and that the people in any country seldom reason—still more seldom do they elect men for public offices according to their qualifications. There are none of our readers who do not remember to have seen illustrations of this in their own time. How often have the worst men been elected in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, in preference to the best, the most ignorant in preference to the most intelligent? If it be urged that the masses of the present day are intelligent enough to understand that there is nothing frightful in an eclipse either of the sun or moon, it may as forcibly be replied that we of the present day have the benefit of the printing press. The Athenians had no daily or weekly journals filled with news from all parts of the world, or containing accounts of discoveries and inventions.

No man ever lived that understood the people in this respect better than Pericles. All his contemporaries who give any account of his character, concur in the statement that he carefully concealed his talents as well as his learning from the people; and their views have been adopted by the most careful and reliable of his more recent biographers. We are told by Plutarch that in his youth he stood in great fear of the people, because he knew how badly they are apt to reason when they do so at all. It seems that his countenance had some resemblance to that of Pisistratus the tyrant, and

* Life of Nicias.

"he perceived that old men were much struck by a further resemblance in the sweetness of his voice, the volubility of his tongue, and the roundness of his periods. As he was moreover of a noble family and opulent fortune, and his friends were the most considerable men in the state, he dreaded the ban of ostracism, and therefore intermeddled not with state affairs, *but behaved with great courage and intrepidity in the field.*"*

He knew that courage was pleasing to all classes; that it became the statesman and the orator no less than the soldier, and accordingly, far from concealing it, he allowed no suitable opportunity to pass without displaying it; although in no boastful spirit, for he was far too great a man to be a braggart.

Pericles was still more distinguished, if possible, for his eloquence than for his courage. He was universally regarded as the most powerful orator of his time. The most competent of all human judges have awarded him this distinction. We shall presently see what was the estimate of Plato, which, however, was not higher than that of Aristotle and Xenophon. But how did he deserve the applause of such illustrious judges? Let no one think that that magical power of his eloquence which has led Quintilian and others to say that the goddess of persuasion rested on his lips,† was solely the gift of nature; it was, to a great extent, the result of hard study and research, commenced in early youth and continued through life. First he made himself acquainted, as far as it was possible, with all that was great and noble in science and art; then, as we are told by Plutarch, "desiring to make his language a proper vehicle for his sublime sentiments, and to speak in a manner that became the dignity of his life, he availed himself greatly of what he had learned from Anaxagoras, adorning his eloquence with the rich colors of philosophy. Hence he is said to have gained the surname

---

* Plutarch in Vita.

† "Why need I dwell on the sweetness of Xenophon, sweetness which is unaffected, but which no affectation can attain? so that even the Graces themselves are said to have formed his style, *and the testimony of the old comedy concerning Pericles*, may justly be applied to him, that *the goddess of persuasion was seated on his lips.*" (L. x. c. 1.) Pliny quotes the passage of Eupolis here alluded to, in the twenticth epistle of his first book; and as the Greek student may be curious to see it, we subjoin it in the original, premising, for the satisfaction of those unacquainted with that language, that the sense of it is contained in the extract just quoted from Quintilian:

Προὸς δέ γ' αὖ τούτῳ τάχ' ἡ
Πειθὼ τις ἐπεκά θητο τοῖοι χείλεοιν.
Οὕτως ἐχήλει καὶ μόνος των βητόρων,
Τὸ κέντρον ἐγκατέλιπε τοις ἀχροωμένοις.

of Olympius, though some will have it to have been from the edifices with which he adorned the city, and others from his high authority in peace and war."

Need we say that any of the three reasons assigned would have proved him a great man; for neither his eloquence nor his statesmanship contributed more to his renown, or gave him a higher claim to the gratitude of posterity, than those wonderful structures to which Plutarch alludes, and which, even in their ruined state at the present day, still continue to command universal admiration as the most perfect specimens of sculpture that any age, ancient or modern, has produced? But none of the many noble gifts with which nature and education had adorned his mind, is better attested than his eloquence. "They tell us," says Plutarch, "that in his harangues he thundered and lightened, and that his tongue was armed with thunder. Thucydides, the son of Milesius, is said to have given a pleasant account of the force of his eloquence. Thucydides was a great and respectable man, who for a long time opposed the measures of Pericles; and when Archidamus, one of the kings of Lacedæmon, asked him, "Which was the best wrestler, Pericles or he," he answered, "When I throw him, he says he was never down, and he *persuades the very spectators to believe so.*"

There are none who give any account of his oratory, who do not pay him a similar tribute. In all the sublime pages of Plato there is scarcely a finer passage than that in which he gives Socrates' estimate of the eloquence of Pericles, and from which we extract a sentence or two: "All the great arts," says Socrates, "require a subtle and speculative research into the law of nature, for that loftiness of thought and perfect mastery over every subject seems to be derived from some such source as this, which Pericles possessed in addition to a great natural genius. For meeting, I think, with Anaxagoras, who was a person of this kind, and being filled with speculative research and having arrived at the nature of intelligence and want of intelligence, about which Anaxagoras made that long discourse, he drew from thence to the art of speaking whatever would contribute to its advantage."*

Thucydides tells us that whenever the Athenians evinced a disposition to be rash and violent, he excited in their minds wholesome fears, and that whenever, on the contrary, they were inclined to be timid, his magic eloquence inspired them with the

* Plato in Phædrus.

highest courage.* To this, however, the historian adds, that we are not to consider the eloquence of Pericles, extraordinary as it was, as conveying the whole secret of his astonishing influence over the Athenians for nearly half a century. "This alone," he says, "was not sufficient, but the orator was a man of probity and unblemished reputation. Money could not bribe him; he was so much above the desire of it, that though he added greatly to the opulence of the state, which he found not inconsiderable, and though his power exceeded that of many kings and tyrants, some of whom bequeathed to their posterity the sovereignty they had obtained, yet he added not one drachma to his paternal estate." Be it remembered that this is the testimony of one whose whole family was opposed to Pericles. Valerius Maximus regards his wonderful power over the Athenians as something more than human. He tells us that by the force of persuasion he put a yoke on the free necks of the Athenians, which they did not know how, or probably did not wish, to remove. The historian adds, that even when he spoke against their wishes and intentions, such was the force of his eloquence that they accepted his opposition with pleasure; that, in short, so complete was his mastery over all who heard him that they could not help being convinced by him against the evidence of their senses.† This will enable us to understand in its true sense what is often quoted from the same historian against Pericles, namely, that there was no other difference between Pisistratus and him than that the former exercised tyranny by force of arms, while the latter did so without arms.‡ Still higher is the estimate of Cicero, than whom no one has discussed the whole subject more fully, or was better competent to do so. Throughout his admirable work on oratory,§ we find allusions to Pericles as a model—as an orator scarcely second

---

* *Ὅπότε γὰν αἴσθοιτό τι αὐτοὺς παρὰ καιρὸν ὕβρει θαρσοντας λέγων κατέπλεσσεν ἐπ' τὸ φοβεῖσθαι. καὶ δέδιότας, αὖ ἀλόγως, αντιχθίση πάμπον ἐπὶ τὸ θαρσεῖν, ἐγίγνετό τε λόγω μεν, δημοκρατία, ἐργω δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ανδρὸς ἀρχή.—Thucy. Lib. II.*

† Pericles felicissimus naturæ incrementis, sub Anaxagora præceptore summo studio perpolitus et instructus, liberis Athenarum cervicibus jugum servitutis imposuit egit enim ille urbem, et versavit arbitrio suo. Cumque adversus voluntatem populi loqueretur, jucunda nibilominus et popularis ejus vox erat. Itaque veteris comœdiæ maledica lingua, quamvis potentiam viri perstringere cupiebat, tamen in labris ejus hominis melle dulciorem leporem fatebatur habitare: inque animis eorum, qui illum audierant, quasi aculeos quosdam relinqui prædicabat.—*Valerius Maximus, Lib. VIII., Cap. IX.*

‡ Quid enim inter Pisistratum et Periclem interfuit, nisi quod ille armatus, hic sine armis tyrannidem gessit?—*Ib.*

§ De Oratore.

even to Demosthenes. In one place he tells us that he charmed by his sweetness, he excited admiration by his copiousness, and that he inspired terror by his strength.* He informs us elsewhere that it was Athens that produced the first orator; "and that orator," he says, "was Pericles. Before his time, and that of his contemporary Thucydides, nothing is to be found which resembles true eloquence. It is believed, however, that a long time previously, old Solon, Pisistratus, and Clisthenes possessed merit for their age. Subsequently, Themistocles seemed superior to the others by his talents and his language, as well as by his enlightened intelligence as a politician. Finally, Pericles, renowned by so many other qualities, was so particularly by that of the great orator."† There were some orations extant in the time of Quintilian, which were generally attributed to Pericles, but that judicious critic found, on examination, that they were entirely disproportioned to his reputation. Thucydides, it is true, professes to give us in his history‡ his famous funeral oration over those who fell in the first battles of the Peloponnesian war, but few believe at the present day that this is the genuine address of Pericles; it seems much more probable, from various circumstances, that it is the fabrication of the historian. This was the opinion both of Livy and Sallust, each of whom adopted what they regarded as the plan of Thucydides, namely, that of fabricating speeches for their great men—such as were in accordance with their character, and gave some idea of their style, and might, therefore, be received without any great violence to truth or justice as the genuine efforts of those to whom they were attributed. That the oration referred to was emphatically a great one, is beyond dispute. It is that in which the orator made use of the beautiful and striking comparison of the destruction of youth with the loss of spring to the year. Another famous oration by Pericles is that pronounced in memory of those Athenians who fell in the Samian war. A passage reproduced by Stesimbrotus, and copied by Plutarch, is as fol-

* Hujus suavitate maxime hilaratæ sunt Athenæ hujus ubertatem et copiam admiratæ, ejusdem vim dicendi terroremque timuerunt.—*Cicero in Bruto.*

† Quintilian quotes Cicero as an authority on the same subject, as follows:—Cicero in Bruto negat ante Periclem scriptum quicquam quod ornatum oratorium habeat: ejus aliqua ferri. Equidem non reperio quicquam tanta eloquentiæ fama dignum: ideoque minus miror esse qui nihil ab eo scriptum putent hæc autem quæ feruntur, ab aliis esse composita.—*Quintil. Instit. Orator, Lib. III., Cap. I.*

‡ Lib. ii. 35.

lows: "They are become immortal like the gods; for the gods themselves are not visible to us; but from the honors they receive, and the happiness they enjoy, we conclude they are immortal; and such should those brave men be who die for their country."*

Nothing is more common at the present day than to allege that superior culture, even when combined with superior natural gifts, has a tendency to render its possessor vain, arrogant, and scornful; but a more modest man never lived than Pericles; never had the common people a truer friend, or one who sympathized more sincerely with them in their afflictions. Cimon, who was altogether a different man, though of respectable talents and attainments, was in favor of the aristocracy, and opposed to the influence of the people. Pericles was illustrious by his birth, illustrious by his learning, illustrious by his genius; he was, besides, one of the wealthiest men in Greece, having inherited a princely fortune from his father; but the humblest magistrate, who had himself belonged to the people, could not listen more attentively to the complaint or appeal of the poor man, or take more pains to do him justice.

Great and good as he was, he was not spared by the satirists of his time. We shall see as we proceed that they did not content themselves with assailing his private character, even in those points which are held to be sacred in every civilized society; the female members of his family were attacked with equal virulence and malignity; in short, all, whether male or female, who had any friendly relations with him; but although he was all-powerful in Athens for more than forty years—more powerful than most sovereigns whose governments are despotic, he never deprived any one of his liberty on personal grounds. Even those who abused and threatened him in the streets had no officer of the law sent after them. He reasoned with them as a generous parent would with a froward child; and it is pleasant to add that in doing so he seldom failed to turn their hatred into good will. In illustration of this noble trait, we are told that "when a vile and abandoned fellow loaded him a whole day with reproaches and abuse, he bore it with patience and silence, and continued in public for the despatch of some urgent affairs. In the evening he walked slowly home, this impudent wretch following and insulting him all the way with the most scurri-

* Plutarch in Vita Per.

lous language. And as it was dark when he came to his own door, he ordered one of his servants to take a torch and light the man home."*

How differently would one "of the people," suddenly placed in a position for which he was not qualified, have acted! The sublime studies to which he had devoted his life taught him to make allowance for the frailties of human nature, especially in its rude and uncultivated state. He might have consigned the man who treated him as described to a dungeon, and ruined the prospects of his family as well as himself. Instead of this he made his assailant ashamed of his conduct, and what was more, he made him as much attached to him as a friend as he had previously been opposed to him as an enemy.

This incident would show by itself that he was a man of superior mind; for how few do we find in the world's history that have given proof of similar greatness of soul. There have been some, however, who treated their assailants after the manner of Pericles. We are told that when Julius Cæsar was lampooned by Catullus, he invited him to supper, and treated him with such generous civility that he made the poet his friend. The only modern example worthy of note we remember at the present moment, is that of Cardinal Mazarine, who gave the kindest treatment to the learned Quillet, who had severely reflected on his eminence in a famous Latin poem. The cardinal sent for him, and after some kind expostulations upon what he had written, assured him of his esteem, and dismissed him with a promise of the next good abbey that should become vacant, which he accordingly conferred on him in a few months. It cannot be alleged that Pericles would not have been as ready to forgive a poet or satirist as he was to forgive the common, illiterate person who attacked him in the manner described; for we have abundant proof to the contrary. We need only mention the poets Cratinus, Teliclides, and Aristophanes, each of whom had satirized Pericles and been kindly treated in return. Thus Cratinus, in his play entitled *Chirons*, uses the following language:

> "Faction received old Time to her embraces:
> Hence came a *tyrant-spawn on earth called Pericles*,
> In heaven the *head compellor*."

In a similar spirit Teliclides reproaches the Athenians for

* Plutarch in Vita Per.

having given him too much power. It was fortunate for the poet's fame that he did so; for it is only by his attack on so illustrious a statesman and orator, that he has saved himself from oblivion. The following lines, quoted by all the biographers of Pericles, from the time of Plutarch to the present, have immortalized the author; although none believe now—indeed, few, if any, capable of judging, ever believed—that they did any justice either to the Athenians or their favorite chief:

> "The tributes of the states, the states themselves
> To bind, to loose; to build and to destroy;
> In peace, in war to govern; nay, to rule
> Their very fate like some superior thing."

It was not alone as a public man that Pericles was modest instead of being arrogant or overbearing. It might be said that policy would induce him to treat even his enemies with forbearance in a republic of which he was himself the chief; but that he despised in private or at heart those whose minds were not cultivated like his own. Indeed, that charge was openly made against him by the poet Ion, who alleged that he was proud and supercilious in conversation.* But Ion being a person of but little culture himself and no learning, and at the same time very ambitious of popularity, was desirous at once of reconciling the people to their ignorance, and at the same time of showing that there may be such a thing as a surfeit of knowledge, and that where it exists it is productive of more evil than good. In short, Ion would reverse the precept of Pope, namely, that a *little* learning is a dangerous thing. Nor can we wonder at this. Are there not similar poets at the present day? Are there not others, too, than poets who think that even statesmen do not require more than a moderate amount of learning, especially in a republic? Are we not told that the man who suits the people is not one who has much learning, or even much talent, but one who understands them; one who knows their wants and is disposed to supply them.† But let us see what the

---

* Plutarch in Vita.

† More than once we have heard Mr. Everett objected to on this ground as a candidate for the presidency, while we have heard others commended for their vulgarity and want of culture. What would Plato, Quintilian, Grotius, even Machiavelli, or any other writer on statesmanship, have said to this? As a reply, we quote a sentence or two from the Roman critic. After enumerating the various acquirements and qualifications necessary for a statesman, Quintilian asks: "Will not the orator (statesman) frequently have to treat of such subjects as these? Will he not have to speak of auguries, oracles, and of everything pertaining to religion, on which the most important deliberations in the senate often

illustrious contemporaries of Pericles say in regard to the effect of learning on him. It matters little to which we turn; but as we have quoted nothing yet from Xenophon, let us see whether his account of Pericles bears out any such charge as that the great statesman was arrogant or overbearing. "Alcibiades," he says, "before he was twenty years of age, held the following discourse with Pericles, who was his guardian, *and chief ruler of the state about laws*. 'Tell me,' said he, 'Pericles, can you tell me what a law is?' 'Certainly,' replied Pericles. 'Teach me, then, in the name of the gods,' said Alcibiades, 'for I, hearing some persons praised as being obedient to the laws, consider that no one can fairly obtain such praise who does not know what a law is.' 'You desire no very difficult matter, Alcibiades,' says Pericles, 'when you wish to know what a law is; for all those regulations are laws which the people on meeting together and approving them, have enacted, directing what we should do and what we should not do.' 'And whether do they direct that we should do good things, or that we should do bad things?' 'Good, by Jupiter, my child, *but bad by no means*.' 'And if it should not be the whole people, but a few, as where there is an oligarchy, that should meet together and enact what we are to do, what are such enactments?' 'Everything,' replied Pericles, 'which the supreme power in the state, on determining what the people ought to do, has enacted, is *called* a law.' 'And if a tyrant, holding rule over the state, prescribes to the citizens what they must do, is such prescription called a law?' 'Whatever a tyrant in authority prescribes,' returned Pericles, 'is also *called* a law.' 'What, then, Pericles,' asked Alcibiades, 'is force and lawlessness? Is it not when the stronger obliges the weaker, not by persuasion, but by compulsion, to do what he pleases?' 'So it appears to me,' replied Pericles. 'Whatever, then, a tyrant compels the people to do by enacting it without gaining their consent, is that an act of lawlessness?' 'Yes,' said Pericles, 'it appears

depend—at least, if he is to be, as I think he ought to be, a well-qualified statesman *(vir civilis)*? *What sort of eloquence can be imagined, indeed, to proceed from a man who is ignorant of the noblest subjects of human contemplation.*" (An hæc non frequenter tradabit orator? Jam de auguriis, responsis, religione denique omni, de quibus maxima sæpe in senatu consilia versata sunt, non erit ei disserendum si quidem, ut nobis placet *futurus est vir civilis idem*? Quæ denique intelligi saltem potest eloquentia *h minis* optima *nescientis* ") Alas! to how many politicians of the present day, who wish to be regarded as statesmen, and who draw large salaries and larger perquisites, as such, does the latter query apply! Yet we boast of the wonderful progress we have made since the time of Pericles!!

to me that it is, for I retract my admission that what a tyrant prescribes to his people *without persuading them*, is a law.' 'But what the few enact, not from gaining the consent of the many, but from having superior power, should we say that that is force, or that it is not?' '*Everything*,' said Pericles, '*which one man obliges another to do without gaining his consent, whether he enact it in writing or not, seems to me to be force rather than law.*' 'Whatever, then, the whole people, when they are stronger than the wealthier class, enact, without their consent, would be an act of force rather than a law.' 'Certainly, Alcibiades,' said Pericles, 'and I, when I was of your age, was very acute at such disquisitions; for we used to meditate and argue about such subjects as you appear now to meditate.' 'Would, therefore,' said Alcibiades, 'that I had conversed with you, Pericles, at the time when you were most acute in discussing such topics.'"*

The conduct of Pericles throughout this dialogue is that of a philosopher, who knows that, let one study as long and as carefully as he will, there are still many things of which he must necessarily be ignorant; not that of a pedant or braggart, who because he has learned a few things imagines, or pretends, that he knows everything. There is good reason to believe that Sir Isaac Newton had Pericles in his mind when he modestly observed, in reply to the encomiums of some friends, that he regarded himself only as a child gathering pebbles on the sea-shore, who, let him exert himself as he might, could never expect to secure more than a very small proportion of the immense whole. That Pericles was proud may indeed be admitted, but his was a sublime pride or grandeur of soul never surpassed, if equalled, by mortal man. His pride was in the greatness and glory of his country. His highest ambition was to see Athens tower above all other cities in whatever reflected honor on the human mind; and who that is acquainted with the history of the world will deny that it was fully realized?

What he accomplished for the Athenians might well seem fabulous if it were not attested by numerous witnesses whose testimony is beyond dispute. But supposing he had done nothing but to build such structures as he did, and give such encouragement to the fine arts, who could deny him a proud niche in the temple of fame? Be it remembered that no sooner did the people decide in his favor

* Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, Book I., ch. 11.

against his rival, Thucydides, than he commenced to realize his great project of conferring undying renown on Athens. His first work was to convert the suburb of the Piræus into a regular and beautiful city. He built a new wall nearly parallel to that built by Themistocles, in order to complete the system of defence which joined Athens to the sea. In a short time the Acropolis was covered with edifices that have never been equalled in magnificence. The famous Parthenon, the Odeon (a theatre for musical and poetical representations), and the Propylæa, were but the work of a few years.

These were scarcely finished when he commenced the restoration of the Temple of Erectheus. All were under the direction of the most eminent architects and sculptors, namely, Ictinus, Calicrates, Coraelus, Mnesicles, and others, all of whom were under the superintendence of Phidias. These various edifices, constructed within a space of twelve years, cost upwards of 3,000 talents, a sum equal to about $17,000,000. At first sight this might seem a large sum, but how small must it be considered when compared with the wonderful results it accomplished! However, no Athenian had to be taxed for it; the revenue alone, as managed by Pericles, was sufficient to meet all expenses, and leave a considerable surplus besides. The revenue, comprising the tribute of 600 talents paid by the allies of Athens, amounted to 1,000 talents (nearly $5,000,000). After deducting from this sum all that was necessary for the state, including the expense of building a large fleet for the Ægean Sea, the celebration of public fêtes, and the various embellishments of the city, already referred to, the annual surplus was such that, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, it had amounted to 6,000 talents, a sum equal to about $30,000,000.*

Having thus briefly glanced at the character of Pericles as an orator, a philosopher, and a man of taste, we now proceed to consider him as a statesman; but let us premise before doing so, that in order to do him justice in any one of these capacities, especially in that of a statesman, a much

* In order to comprehend these figures, it will be necessary to bear in mind that the whole population of Attica at this time was only as follows: Athenians, 300,000; Strangers, 45,000; Slaves, 365,000. Add to this the fact that the precious metals were nearly three times as valuable in the time of Pericles as they are at present; then some adequate idea may be formed of the public spirit of the Athenians.

larger space would be required than we can devote on the present occasion to all.

The Athenians had a very different idea of a statesman from that entertained by most persons at the present day. They made a very broad distinction between a statesman and politician. While they regarded the former as one whose mind was richly stored with multifarious knowledge, they regarded the latter as not necessarily possessed of anything worthy the name of knowledge. This is happily and amusingly illustrated in the plays of Aristophanes.

That the Romans entertained similar views in the golden age of their literature and mental activity, is everywhere obvious in their writings. For a proof of the fact we need only refer to Quintilian, one of the most reliable and judicious of writers. Quintilian considered oratory as essential to statesmanship, and held that, in order to be a perfect orator, one must combine the most extensive learning and culture with the strictest probity and integrity. If the mere forensic orator should possess these various qualifications, what should we expect from the statesman, who is supposed to be eloquent on every subject that has any relation to the welfare of the state, or the happiness of the people? Hence it is that the most eminent philosophers and jurists of all ages are of opinion that neither poet, nor astronomer, nor mathematician, nor chemist requires so much accurate knowledge, or so many natural gifts, as a statesman.

We have already shown that Pericles possessed all the necessary qualifications according to the severest standard. But how did he use those qualifications? We have said in general terms that he proved a wise and good ruler to the Athenians. Now let us glance at some of the evidences of his statesmanship; let us see whether his conduct and acts were in general statesman-like. Towards the year 468 B. C., Pericles aided by Ephialtes commenced to oppose the existing oligarchy, at the head of which was Cimon, on the ground that the people were overtaxed, and that much more expense was incurred than the legitimate administration of the government required. The effect of his eloquence was such that Cimon was brought to trial; but the oligarchy having still a majority, he was acquitted. Soon after they voted in favor of sending an army, commanded by their chief, to aid the Spartans against their revolted helots. Pericles advised the ruling party against the imprudence of such a step, telling them that the Spartans would not thank them for their pains, but, on the

contrary, would be more likely to regard the act as an offensive interference in their domestic affairs. Cimon and his supporters were of the opposite opinion; and their chief argument was, that so friendly a manifestation on the part of Athens would have the effect of uniting the two cities more intimately to each other than they had ever been before. But the result proved still worse than Pericles had predicted. The Spartans sent back the auxiliaries, informing them, in language by no means complimentary, that their services were not required, and that they should have stayed at home until they were sent for. This annoyed and mortified the Athenians to such a degree that they immediately voted to ostracise Cimon. This virtually put an end to the oligarchy for the time; but those who most regretted the loss of their power, could not help admiring the wisdom and foresight of Pericles. All admitted that in giving his advice he was actuated by the noblest motives. Now (461), however, the popular party had a decided majority, and no sooner did Pericles get into power than he began to carry into execution his various projects of reform.

One of the first of these reforms was the establishment of trial by jury. We call attention to this the more particularly, because there is no opinion more generally entertained at the present day, both in this country and in England, than that the world owes the idea of trial by jury to our Saxon ancestors. No one, indeed, acquainted with history, would venture to make such an assertion; but it has been the boast of a certain class of newspapers, for twenty years past, that not only trial by jury, but almost every other political or judicial idea of any value, which we possess, had its origin in the woods of Scandinavia; whereas both Plato and Aristotle, as well as Thucydides, tell us about the Athenian juries. Plato would have jurymen in his Model Republic, for he remarks in Book XII., chap. 4, of his Laws: "Let it therefore be laid down as a law, that he who is about to *act as a juryman* shall take an *oath as a juryman*." In the third book of his Politics, and first chapter, Aristotle mentions the right of serving on a jury as one of the privileges of citizenship.*

* "Our former description of a citizen," he says, "will admit of correction; for in some governments the offer of *dicast* and of a member of the general assembly is not an intermediate one; but there are particular persons appointed for these purposes; some or all of the citizens being appointed *jurymen* or members of the assembly."

Hitherto the Areopagus and the Council of Five Hundred exercised both the political and judicial power of the state. Pericles deprived them of the latter, and confided it to the juries, except in cases of homicide, which was still retained by the Areopagus. This he regarded as of the greatest importance, as it rendered all public functionaries liable to be tried by their fellow-citizens. The next important act of Pericles was to appoint two commissions: one consisting of seven magistrates, whose duty it was to oppose every proposition or measure which they deemed contrary to the existing laws; the other consisting of a much larger number, whose duty it was to propose to the people the revision of such laws as they thought defective.

The oligarchical party were so exasperated at seeing the power taken out of their own hands in this manner that they assassinated Ephialtes, the colleague of Pericles. The latter was not in the least intimidated by so outrageous an act. Finding himself now the sole chief of the democratic party, he persevered in the same policy which had already led to such important results. The first years of his administration were distinguished by the acquisition of Megara as an ally of Athens, and a successful war against Corinth and Ægina. The Spartans looked on these successes with jealousy, foreseeing that if they were not checked in time, Athens would soon exercise her domination over the whole of continental Greece; and, accordingly, they did not conceal their intention of attacking the rival city as soon as they could suppress the insurrection of their slaves.

Not doubting but the Spartans would do all the mischief they could, Pericles resolved to be prepared for them in time. With this view, he proposed to join the city to the sea by two ramparts, one forty stadia in length, the other thirty. This he knew would render Athens, the Piræus, and the Phalerum but one fortification, which, by land, would be capable of resisting all the armies of the Peloponnesus, while by sea it could maintain complete liberty of action. The Spartans, taking offence at these preparations, crossed the Isthmus of Corinth with a considerable army, and gained a victory over the Athenians at Tanagra, which, however, was nearly as bad for themselves as a defeat, and proved an advantage rather than a loss to the Athenians by uniting them to each other.

Taking advantage of the good feeling thus promoted between the different parties, Pericles generously proposed to recal Cimon, his former antagonist. Among the results of

the unanimity of feeling thus produced was the decisive victory gained by the Athenians over the Bœotians at Œnophyta,* which gave them an uncontested supremacy over the whole country comprehended between the Isthmus of Corinth and the Pass of Thermopylæ. The next important step of Pericles was to remove the seat of the Ionian confederation from Delos to Athens, causing all the cities that formed that confederation to pay tribute to the sovereign city.

The Athenians were now undisputed masters of the sea, and among their tributary allies they numbered the Megarians, the Locrians, the Phocians, and the Achæians. The Bœotians, however, soon became discontented under the Athenian rule, and revolted. The friends of Cimon being still secretly opposed to Pericles, he was able to send only a small army against the insurgents. It was in vain he warned them against the consequences, telling them that they had better send no army than a weak one; and accordingly the Athenians were defeated at Coroneia by the Bœotians. The other allies, encouraged by the success of the latter, revolted in turn. Even Attica was invaded by the victorious allies, and the most reliable historians are of opinion that owing to the divisions caused among the Athenians by the oligarchists, the city might have been taken had not Pericles given the enemy money as an inducement to retire, as he had no other means of saving it. Yet, Thucydides, the son of Milesius, now at the head of the oligarchist party, accused Pericles of having brought all these misfortunes on the country. Plutarch tells us that "he was charged with having brought the greatest disgrace upon the Athenians by removing the public treasures of Greece from Delos, and taking them into his own custody; that he had not left himself even the specious apology of having caused the money to be brought to Athens for its greater security, and to keep it from being seized by the barbarians; that Greece must needs consider it as the highest insult, and an act of open tyranny, when she saw the money she had been obliged to contribute towards the war lavished by the Athenians in *gilding their city and ornamenting it with statues and temples* that cost a thousand talents, as a proud and vain woman decks herself out with jewels." The reply of Pericles was, "That they were *not obliged* to give the allies any account of the sums they had received, since they had kept the barbarians at a distance, and effectually defended the allies

* Now Inia.

who had not furnished either horses, ships, or men, but only contributed money, which is no longer the property of the giver, but of the receiver, if he performs the conditions on which it is received. That as the state was provided with all the necessaries of war, *its superfluous wealth should be laid out on such works as when well executed would be eternal monuments of its glory, and which during their continuance would diffuse a universal plenty;* for as so many kinds of labor, and such a variety of instruments and materials were requisite to these undertakings, every art would be exerted, every hand employed, almost the whole of the city would be in pay, and be, at the same time, both adorned and supported by itself."*

No person of taste or culture, however well versed in the art of government, will deny that the reasons assigned by Pericles for constructing the immortal works alluded to were just and fair, and such as might be expected from a true statesman, one who was capable of appreciating the beautiful as well as the useful. It may well be asked, What other use could he have made of the superfluous wealth of the republic, that could have redounded more to its glory? Nor did the people fail to admit the fact when taught to view it in its proper light; although it could not be expected that even the Athenians, enlightened as they undoubtedly were, could estimate the value of such masterpieces both of architecture and sculpture as those which adorned the Acropolis of Athens. Accordingly, when he asked the people "Whether they thought he had expended too much?" they answered in the affirmative; but when he remarked, "Then be it charged to my account, not yours; only let the new edifices be inscribed with my name, not that of the people of Athens," they cried out that he might spend as much as he pleased of the public treasures, without sparing them in the least."†

This, perhaps, showed his influence over the people more than their appreciation of his sublime works. Be this as it may, the opposition of the oligarchic party still continued. In order to put an end to a struggle which if permitted to continue could hardly fail to end disastrously, the usual resource of the ostracism was had recourse to. The people being called upon to decide between Pericles and Thucydides, voted the exile of the latter (442 B. C.), and left the former once more sole ruler of Athens, who, as on former

* Plutarch in Vita. † Ibid.

occasions, made the best possible use of his power. He could not please all, however.

Two years after the exile of Thucydides, the Samians, although exempt from tribute, revolted against the domination of Athens, and formally refused to obey it any longer. Pericles reasoned with them in his usual forcible style, telling them that it was very painful to the Athenian people, as well as to himself personally, to have recourse to force, but that if they persisted in their disobedience force could not be avoided. They returned a defiant reply. Pericles immediately fitted out a fleet of twenty ships, which were commanded by six stratages, including the great chief himself, and the poet Sophocles, and in a few weeks laid siege to Samos. The Samians made a gallant resistance, but after holding out for nine months, were obliged to capitulate, although they soon learned that had they only delayed one month longer, the whole confederation of the Peloponnesus would have declared in their favor.

On the return of Pericles to Athens he was received with the greatest enthusiasm. This was the occasion on which he delivered one of his great orations, that on the death of those who had fallen at the siege of Samos. Plutarch tells us that when he came down from the rostrum, the women paid their respects to him and presented him with crowns and chaplets, like a champion just returned victorious from the lists. Only Elpinice addressed him in terms quite different: "Are these actions, then, Pericles, worthy of crowns and garlands which have deprived us of many brave citizens, not in a war with Phœnicians and Medes such as my brother Cimon waged, but in destroying a city united to us both in blood and friendship?"

For five years after this Athens enjoyed profound tranquillity; in the meantime Pericles continued to introduce reforms whenever they seemed needed, and did all in his power to encourage literature and the fine arts. But an event took place in the island of Corcyra* in 434 B.C. which was the indirect cause of one of the most terrible wars that had yet desolated Greece. That island was an emancipated colony of Corinth, which entered into a conflict with the metropolis for the possession of the city of Epidamnus. The Corcyrians were first successful; but on reflection they came to the conclusion that it would be impossible for them to contend alone

* Corfu.

with so powerful a city as Corinth. Resolving, however not to part with the disputed city, they offered themselves as allies to the Athenians, on condition that the latter would aid them against Corinth. Their geographical position would render them highly important to the Athenians as allies and they sent ambassadors to Athens, who discussed the whole question before an assembly of the people. In doing so they took occasion to urge that a war between Athens and the league of Peloponnesus was inevitable; that by means of concessions the Athenians might be able to retard, but not prevent it; that it was therefore better to take the first step, and that when the fleet of Athens was joined to that of Corcyra Corinth would be careful not to undertake a war against both.

The Corinthians were quite aware of the efforts thus made by their late colonists; nor did they fail to oppose them as best they could. Their argument was, that they had evinced friendly feelings towards the Athenians in not taking any part against them during their war with the Samians. But a much more forcible argument was, that as long as the Athenians were on terms of friendship with Corinth, they were sure of peace; but that a rupture with that city would be regarded as a declaration of war against the whole confederation of the Peloponnesus.

With his usual generosity, Pericles was in favor of protecting the weak from the strong, and the people readily voted what he advised.* The Corinthians did not hesitate to carry out their threat against Corcyra; but they were completely repulsed by an Athenian squadron. In order to avenge themselves for this, they caused

* All his contemporaries agree in assigning the noblest traits of character to Pericles. It has been justly said of him, that with the highest degree of manly courage he combined the tenderness and generosity of a woman. In illustration of this we will note an incident in his conduct towards Anaxagoras. The gifted and learned have in all ages been remarkable for their sensitiveness; nor did Anaxagoras, wise as he was in other respects, form an exception to the rule. Although he knew that Pericles would not have him want any of the comforts of life that money could purchase, he would rather die than call on him for aid; whereas, his friend was so absorbed in public affairs that he found no time to think of those who would not think of themselves. The incident is related as follows by Plutarch, and needs no further comment: "Nay, for want of such prudential regards, this very Anaxagoras lay neglected and unprovided for, insomuch that the poor old man had covered up his head, and was going to starve himself. But an account of it being brought to Pericles, *he was extremely moved at it, ran immediately* to him, expostulated, entreated; bewailing not so much the fate of his friend as his own if his administration should lose so valuable a counsellor. Anaxagoras uncovering his face, replied, 'Ah, Pericles, those that have need of a lamp, take care to supply it with oil.'"

the revolt of Potidæa,* one of the allies of Athens. The Megarians withdrew their allegiance at the same time, although only a brief period had elapsed since they themselves had solicited an alliance with Athens. The Athenians were so much irritated against them on this account, that they passed a law rendering it a capital offence, punishable with death, for a Megarian to carry on any commerce either with Athens or any of her allies. It would be foreign to our purpose to enter into details as to the causes of these various acts; all we undertake in this branch of our subject is simply to give a general idea, as briefly as we can, of the nature of the conflict which culminated at the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war. On the complaints of the Corinthians and Megarians, the Spartans resolved to vindicate by force of arms the rights of their allies. They convoked a general congress of the Ionian states in November, 432 B.C., which voted in January following, by a large majority, to deliver the Greeks from what they called the Athenian despotism.

Pericles was now in his sixty-ninth year. At the present day there are not many who have held the highest position in the state for nearly forty years that are able to maintain their influence. Pericles did so better than any other chief of a republic that has ever lived, although it may be doubted whether any public man, in any position, had more powerful or more uncompromising enemies to deal with. He had seen two generations of opponents pass away, or fall into obscurity, without their being able to do him any harm—the first headed by Cimon, the second by Thucydides. Now several new opponents had entered the field against him, and were vying with each other in trying to do him all the harm in their power, including Cleon, Simmias, and Lacrotidas. These did not hesitate to accuse Pericles of being the cause of the war now declared, and which threatened the very existence of Athens. Nor did they do so in vain. The people, too often fickle as well as ungrateful, began to pay attention to the charges of his enemies. The friends known to be dearest to him, including Phidias, Anaxagoras, and even Aspasia, were one after another accused of grave offences against the state—the object of his enemies being to prepare the way for a more serious accusation against himself than they had ever before ventured to make.

---

* Now Pinaka.

The shrewd Spartans were doing their best at the same time to bring disgrace upon Pericles, for, old as he was, and now grown feeble in health, they knew that he was a more formidable enemy than all his opponents put together. Accordingly, their first demand on the Athenians was for the expulsion of their well-tried and faithful chief from the city, under the singular pretext that he belonged, by his mother's side, to the family of the Alcmæonides, who, more than a century previously, had been pronounced guilty of sacrilege in relation to the goddess Athena. To this strange demand the Athenians replied, "that the Spartans had much more recently been guilty of two acts analogous to the one of the Alcmæonides, and that before seeking among foreigners a violation of the right of asylum, they had better commence at home. In addition to this they were informed that the Athenians were ready to oppose force by force."

The Spartans failing in regard to Pericles, made several other claims of a much more serious nature, including the withdrawal of the decree against Megara, the freedom of Ægina, and the raising of the blockade of Potidæa. These various propositions were submitted to an assembly of the people. Pericles advised them, in one of his noblest orations (February, 431), to resist, and they obeyed him as promptly and implicitly as ever. The war was commenced by the Thebans, for all the surrounding republics were so jealous of the greatness and glory of Athens that there was nothing they yearned for more than to crush it. The first attempt was not successful, but nearly all the other states of Greece having joined the Spartans, Pericles knew that it was necessary to adopt every precaution in order to save the Athenians from annihilation. Knowing that it was impossible for them to protect even so small a territory as Attica against the whole confederation of the Peloponnesus, he advised all to shut themselves up with all their movable riches, within the walls of the city, and abandon their territory to the ravages of the invaders.

At first sight this might seem unworthy of a general and a statesman, but Pericles knew that as the Athenians were masters of the sea, they need have no fear of famine, and that it were better to see Attica ravaged than Athens taken for want of sufficient men to defend it. Through the energy of Pericles, one hundred ships were ready to sail in two weeks; and these were joined by a considerable fleet from Corcyra and other places. The principal event of the first campaign was

the destruction of all the towns and property on the eastern coast of Attica, the invaders meeting with no opposition for the reason already assigned. With their combined fleets the Athenians sailed round Peloponnesus and laid waste much of its western coast. They also took possession of Astacus, Arcania, expelled its tyrant, and established a democracy; and the people of Cephalonia seeing how successful they had thus been, surrendered to them without resistance, and became their allies.

Meantime Archidamus, King of Sparta, who had command of all the armies of the Peloponnesian league, did his best to induce the Athenians to give him battle; but this was contrary to the advice of Pericles, whose policy it was to avoid a general engagement with an army of at least sixty thousand men—an army celebrated both in Europe and Asia for its superior discipline and bravery. It was soon proved that the great chief was right, for the Spartan king, finding it impossible to maintain his troops, returned home by forced marches by way of Bœotia. The Athenians were now successful both by sea and land; and they had every reason to believe that, notwithstanding the vast numerical superiority of the enemy, they would soon put down the war. But just as the prospect seemed brightest—while Pericles was inspiring the most timid with the courage and daring of heroes by the irresistible force of his eloquence, a plague broke out in the city which decimated the inhabitants.

It was but natural that this should discourage even the bravest. Accordingly, Pericles exerted himself more than ever. Nor were his exertions confined to his orations, spirit-stirring and valuable as the latter were; while the plague raged with the greatest intensity, he fitted out a fleet of one hundred vessels, and sailed with it himself on an expedition against the Peloponnesus. But his brave and manly efforts were of no avail; for the plague broke out with such fatal virulence among both crews and troops, that he was obliged to return to the Piræa without attempting to inflict any injury on the enemy. Short a time was he as absent from the city, he found the people much changed in every respect. The combined scourges of pestilence and war had broken their spirit. In this state of mind they were easily induced by the chiefs of the oligarchy to attribute their misfortunes to Pericles; all of a sudden they became so much incensed against him that they not only refused to reelect him, but also inflicted a heavy fine on him on pretence that he had devoted a portion of the public treasures to

his own use. Conscious as he was of having served his country to the utmost of his power, and of having never sought to make the slightest addition to his private estate, it is almost needless to say that distinguished as he was for his fortitude, and always ready to find an excuse for the thoughtlessness of the people, he felt not a little grieved at this evidence of their ingratitude.

At the same time he lost several of his dearest friends by the pestilence, including his two legitimate sons; and he began to feel the first pangs of the disease of which he died soon after. He uttered no reproaches against the people whom he had served so well, and who had sought to reward him only with disgrace. But justice and truth, though sometimes trampled under foot, will in general be pretty sure to prevail and vindicate themselves. It was so in the case of Pericles; for while suffering most acutely both in body and mind, the intelligence was brought him that the people repented the wrong they had done him, and that in proof of their sincerity they had re-elected him strategas, and expressed their regret in the most solemn manner for the iniquitous judgment they had passed upon him. In short, they left nothing undone that seemed calculated in any manner to make amends to their illustrious and faithful chief for having done him so cruel an injustice. Although there was no Athenian law more strictly executed than that which excluded illegitimate children from the rights of citizenship, in order to console Pericles an exception was made in favor of his son by Aspasia, so that the latter might inherit the name as well as the fortune of one who conferred such glory on Athens.

He survived the shock of the unrighteous judgment passed upon him about a year, during which time he took as active a part in public affairs as the nature of his malady would allow. Some think that his disease was a mild form of the plague. Such is the account given by Plutarch: "It was rather a lingering distemper," he says, "which with frequent intermissions, and by slow degrees, consumed his body, and *impaired the vigor of his mind.*" After making this observation the historian proceeds to remark that "Theophrastus has a disquisition in his ethics, whether men's characters may be changed with their fortune, *and the soul so affected with the disorders of the body as to lose her vigor;* and there he relates that Pericles showed to a friend who came to visit him in his sickness an amulet which the women had hung about his

neck, intimating that he must be sick indeed, since he submitted to so ridiculous a piece of superstition."

On account of this passage there are some who think that Pericles had lost the use of his reason some months before his death. But we have no proof of any such fact; on the contrary, all the evidence that has come down to us bearing on the subject, tends to show that he retained all the powers of his intellect to the last day of his life. Even the testimony of Plutarch leads to this conclusion; although he is the only respectable authority which those entertaining the opposite view can adduce. He tells us that "when he was at the point of death, his surviving friends and the principal citizens sitting about his bed discoursed together concerning his extraordinary virtue and the great authority he had enjoyed, and enumerated his various exploits and the number of his victories; for while he was commander-in-chief he had erected no fewer than nine trophies to the honor of Athens. These things they spoke of supposing that he attended not to what they said, but that his senses were gone. He took notice, however, *of every word they had spoken*, and thereupon delivered himself audibly as follows: "I am surprised that while you dwell upon and extol these acts of mine, though fortune had her share in them, and many other generals have performed the like, you take no notice of the greatest and most honorable part of my character, *that no Athenian through my means ever put on mourning*." One whose intellect had become weak could not have reasoned in this manner, or evinced such excellent sense, or so clear a judgment. Never had even Pericles spoken more like a true philosopher. It was not his brilliant exploits he wished to hear extolled, or those deeds of his that were most likely to render his name immortal; but his skill and foresight as a statesman, and the solicitude which he always felt for the welfare of the Athenian people. In other words, he wished to be spoken of as a good, rather than as a great man. But we have, if possible, still stronger evidence of his perfect sanity during the last years of his life, in the almost universal admission, even of his enemies, that his death at that crisis was an irreparable loss to Athens. "The state of public affairs soon showed the want of Pericles," says Plutarch, "and the Athenians openly expressed their regret for his loss. Even those who in his lifetime could but ill brook his superior power, as thinking themselves eclipsed by it, yet, upon a trial of other orators and demagogues, after he was gone,

soon acknowledged that where severity was required, no man was ever more moderate; or if mildness was necessary, no man kept up his dignity better than Pericles. And his so much envied authority, to which they had given the name of monarchy and tyranny, then appeared to have been the bulwark of the state—so much corruption and such a rage of wickedness broke out upon the commonwealth after his death, which he, by proper restraints, had palliated and kept from dangerous and destructive extremes."*

This is the testimony of all the great men who were contemporaries of Pericles—that is, of the greatest thinkers and reasoners that have ever lived; whereas none worthy of credence prefer any serious charge against him. We have already alluded to certain accusations made against him at different times by those who were jealous of his power and anxious to obtain it for themselves; we have also seen that any of them that were capable of being investigated were found to be erroneous and set aside as such. Thus foiled in various efforts, his enemies had but one means left to injure his character; they could only pretend that he led a vicious life, and that so far as he could he made the most beautiful of the wives and daughters of the Athenians as vicious as himself. Had he been what they represented him, they would not have attempted to libel him in this base manner; but they knew that he never had any one prosecuted or deprived of his liberty for anything however false or slanderous he might say of himself. This was one of the reasons why he was able to congratulate himself as he did at the close of a long life, that he had never caused an Athenian to put on mourning.

We will now see what was the nature of the slanders alluded to—not because we believe they have any reasonable foundation, but in order to show how much philosophy, fortitude, and forbearance it required to allow their authors to escape unpunished. "La debauche des femmes," says Bayle, "fut l'un des vices qu'on lui reprocha plus." Not content with vilifying him in private, the lower grade of poets represented the female members of his family on the stage as guilty of the grossest excesses, making himself, however, more licentious and more shameless than all. That he had some intrigues with women, and did not confine his amours within the bounds prescribed by the Athen-

* Plutarch in Vita.

ian laws, cannot be denied. It may be added that conduct like his in this respect would be severely censured at the present day; but what he was known to have really done was exaggerated beyond all reasonable bounds; or rather, it was made the pretext of accusing him with every species of depravity which lust in its worst form could suggest.

His first wife was a relative of his own. She had previously been married to Hipponnicus, by whom she had one son. We are informed that Pericles had two sons by her; that he then became disgusted with her and gave her to another man; and that she was quite as willing for the change as he. Soon after he became attached to Aspasia, one of the most beautiful and most accomplished women of her time, but whose reputation, whether justly or unjustly, has been much sullied. In short, her character has come down to us as that of a courtesan; although Plutarch and others tell us that Socrates was in the habit of visiting her regularly and taking his friends with him in order to discuss questions in rhetoric and politics with her. The real motive of the philosopher in visiting her might be doubted, however, were it not that some of the first citizens of Athens visited her in company with their wives, in order that the latter might profit by the charms of her conversation.

This would show that whatever indiscretions she may have been guilty of, she was by no means a degraded woman; at least that she was not regarded as such. Speaking of Pericles' first wife, Plutarch says: "She was married to another, and he took Aspasia, for whom he had the tenderest regard; insomuch that he never went out upon business or returned without saluting her." Now, does it follow that because he was thus attached to Aspasia, whether it be true that he was married to her or not, he must have been a libertine who used all his influence to debauch the wives and daughters of the Athenians? Still less logical is it to suppose that it was to gratify her whims he declared war against the Samians, Megarians, and others, and thus gave rise to the Peloponnesian war. Yet his enemies made both charges against him, and several others on no better grounds. Even his friendship for great artists was made a basis of accusation against him, as, for example, in the case of Phidias, the most renowned sculptor of all antiquity, who was said to invite the Athenian ladies to see his sculptures, only in order that they might gratify the lust of Pericles. Pyrilampes, another friend, was said to keep a large collection of curious and beautiful birds,

for no other purpose than to make presents of them to such women as granted favors to Pericles. Lest all this might not seem sufficiently odious, particular cases of seduction were alleged against him; and finally, his detractors proceeded so far in their villany as to accuse him of having debauched his son's wife. In recording this fact, Plutarch remarks, with his usual candor and love of justice: "But what wonder is it, if men of a satirical turn daily sacrificed the characters of the great to that malevolent demon, the envy of the multitude, when Stesembrotus of Thasos has dared to lodge against Pericles that horrid and groundless accusation of corrupting his son's wife?"

We need only notice one charge more of this kind, that respecting Elpinice, the sister of Cimon, whom he is accused of having corrupted while she was trying to gain his sympathy in favor of her brother, when it was generally believed that he would be sentenced to death. What the lady had said to him on his return from the conquest of the Samians, while other ladies were enthusiastic in their praise of his bravery and generalship, and the reply which he is said to have made to her, would be almost sufficient, without any further evidence, to show that there was no truth in the allegation. The version of Plutarch is that "Elpinice before this had softened the resentment of Pericles against Cimon, and procured her brother a milder sentence than that of death. Pericles was one of those appointed by the people to manage the impeachment; and when Elpinice addressed him as a suppliant, he smiled and said, 'You are old, Elpinice; much too old to solicit in so weighty an affair.' However," adds the historian, "he rose up but once to speak, barely to acquit himself of his trust, and did not bear so hard upon Cimon as the rest of his accusers." But as we have said, the chief, if not the only foundation for all these charges is his admitted intimacy with Aspasia. Now, if she had been the infamous woman she is represented by his enemies, is it likely that the Athenians would have bestowed on her son the rights of citizenship, and allowed him to assume the name of Pericles, and inherit his estate?

It is still more unlikely that Pericles himself would have taken the pains he did to save her when she was prosecuted for impiety, had her character been such as it has been represented by her enemies; for Æschinas tells us that he not only defended her before her accusers with all the power of his wonderful eloquence, but that he shed many tears in im-

ploring mercy for her, begging those who thirsted for her blood to remember that whatever might be said of her conduct in early life, when even the wisest of men are thoughtless, he had ever found her faithful and devoted to him. He succeeded in saving her; but he did not expect the same indulgence for Anaxagoras, who was accused of the same crime—that of speaking disrespectfully of the popular religion, and "introducing new opinions about celestial appearances." He therefore caused his old friend to leave the city, accompanying him a part of the way, giving him all the money he required, and bidding him an affectionate adieu. If we must assume that Aspasia was a bad woman because she was accused in this manner by the Athenians, must we not also assume that Anaxagoras was a bad man? Nay, we must pass a similar judgment on Phidias, for he, too, was prosecuted, and died in prison for no other crime than that he was patronized by Pericles, and was a believer in his philosophy. But we have more satisfactory evidence than even this in her favor, namely, the language of respect and esteem in which the greatest philosophers and severest moralists of the day speak of her son. A passage from Xenophon will sufficiently illustrate this. The following extract will give an idea of the opinions entertained of both father and son by those best qualified to estimate their worth:

Conversing, on one occasion, with Pericles, the son of the great Pericles, Socrates said, "I have hopes, Pericles, that under your leadership the city will become more eminent and famous in military affairs, and will get the better of her enemies." "I wish, Socrates," said Pericles, "that what you say may happen; but how such effects are to be produced, I cannot understand." "Are you willing, then," asked Socrates, "that we should have some conversation on these points, and consider how far there is a possibility of effecting what we desire?" "I am quite willing," replied Pericles. "Are you aware, then," said Socrates, "that the Athenians are not at all inferior in number to the Bœotians?" "I am," said Pericles. "And whether do you think that a greater number of efficient and well-formed men could be selected from the Bœotians, or from the Athenians?" "The Athenians do not appear to me to be inferior in this respect." "And which of the people do you consider to be more united among themselves?" "I think that the Athenians are; for many of the Bœotians, being oppressed by the Thebans, entertain hostile feelings towards them. But at Athens I see nothing of the kind." "But the Athenians are, moreover, of all people, most eager for honor, and most friendly in disposition; qualities which most effectually impel men to face danger in the cause of glory, and of their country." "The Athenians are certainly not to be found fault with in these respects." "And assuredly there is no people that can boast of greater or more numerous exploits of their ancestors than the Athenians; a circumstance by which many are prompted and stimulated to cultivate manly

courage, and to become brave." "All that you say is true, Socrates, but you see that since the slaughter of the thousand occurred at Lebdeia, under Tolmides, and that at Delium, under Hippocrates, the reputation of the Athenians has suffered as far as regards the Bœotians, and the spirit of the Bœotians has been raised as far as regards the Athenians, so that the Bœotians, indeed, who formerly did not dare, even on their own soil, to meet the Athenians in the field, without the aid of the Spartans and other Peloponnesians, now threaten to invade Attica single-handed; while the Athenians, who formerly, when the Bœotians were unsupported, ravaged Bœotia, are afraid lest the Bœotians should lay waste Attica." "I perceive, indeed," said Socrates, "that such is the case; but the city seems to me now to be more favorably disposed for any good general; for confidence produces in men carelessness, indolence, and disobedience, but fear renders them more attentive, obedient, and orderly. You may form a notion of this from people in a ship; for as long as they fear nothing they are all in disordor, but as soon as they begin to dread a storm, or the approach of an enemy, they not only do everything that they are told to do, but are hushed in silence, waiting for the directions to be given, like a band of dancers." "Well, then," said Pericles, "if they would now, assuredly, obey, it would be time for us to discuss how we might incite them to struggle to regain their ancient spirit, glory, and happiness." "If, then," said Socrates, "we wished them to claim property of which others were in possession, we should most effectively urge them to lay claim to it if we proved that it belonged to their fathers, and was their rightful inheritance; and since we wish that they should strive for pre-eminence in valor, we must show them that such pre-eminence was indisputably theirs of old; and that if they now exert themselves to recover it, they will be the most powerful of all people." "How, then, can we convince them of this?" "I think that we may do so if we remind them that they have heard that their most ancient forefathers, of whom we have any knowledge, were the bravest of men."*

It seems to us that no one capable of forming an unprejudiced opinion can examine all the facts bearing on the subject which have any claim to be regarded as testimony, and come to the conclusion that Pericles was more vicious or licentious than most prominent men of his time—nay, most public men of the present day. But even those who accept the statements of his enemies, and regard him as a libertine who had no respect for female virtue, must admit that if he was guilty of this, no other misconduct can fairly be laid to his charge. By the universal voice of historians, biographers, and critics, he stands wholly exculpated from any other accusation that has ever been made against him. His character as a statesman and ruler is wholly unsullied by the slightest blemish; it is a model worthy of imitation for all future ages. The one who has made the nearest approach to him in modern times in the most prominent features of his character as a public man, is Lorenzo de Medici,

* Memorabilia of Socrates, Book III., Chap. V.

who, however, was vastly inferior to him in knowledge, in intellect, and in statesmanlike grasp of mind, not to mention eloquence; while the only modern chief who has equalled him in integrity and genuine patriotism, without the least alloy of ambition or selfishness, is our own great Washington.

Art. II—1. *History of Civilization in Europe.* By M. Guizot. London.

2. *History of Civilization in England.* By Henry Thomas Buckle. New York.

3. *The Man of the North and the Man of the South.* By Charles Victor de Bonstillen. New York.

The range of our knowledge of the physical sciences is wide, and is continually becoming wider. There is nothing in nature but has engaged the earnest attention of the human mind. The telescope has been directed to the distant heavens, and the microscope to the minutest atom; compounds have been analyzed, and the qualities of simples ascertained and described; the mechanical structure of the universe, and the chemical composition of the elements, have been carefully studied and lucidly explained; and the periodical recurrence of phenomena calculated with unerring certainty; yet with all the array of knowledge of physics before him, man remains a comparative stranger to himself, his being presenting an obstacle which meets him at the threshold of investigation; a problem the elements of which he has not yet ascertained.

Nor is this surprising. Physical phenomena return with a regularity which is not slow to suggest that they are the result of immutable laws, and this conceded, the work of investigation into their nature commences. But what of regularity is perceptible in the phenomena of mind? Are the passions—those volumes of apparent inconsistencies and irreconcilable contradictions—subject to external control? Do the impulses which impel one to love to-day and hate the same object to-morrow, which converts the devoted friend into the stealthy assassin, which drives man into a labyrinth of extremes of every conceivable nature—do they owe allegiance to a controlling energy which shapes and directs them? Or is mind an independent fountain of

power and action, and subject to no rules, obedient to no control, modified by no influences, save such as are inherent in itself?

If mind is governed by laws, and subject to influences, it is not wonderful that these have to this day remained measurably a mystery. The phenomena presented were too varied, and too irregularly developed, to admit a solution with that readiness which attends problems relating to the physical universe. Preparatory to reaching even the simplest truths, varied data were required; and even at this time, these are meagre indeed. Nor was mathematical accuracy attainable under any circumstances; but men were compelled at every step of their progress to rest satisfied with approximate conclusions and rational presumptions, which might all be overthrown by some new and unexpected facts.

The laws of the solar system were not discovered in a day, nor a generation; but astronomy had attracted the attention, and engaged the minds, of thinkers, at least four thousand years before Newton explained the principles of gravitation, and demonstrated that it was the force which drew all things to a common centre, thereby retaining the planets in their course, and giving a nearly circular form to their orbits; and more time will be required to explain the forces which give direction to society, and impel it forward; which have already raised the human race far above its infancy of barbarism, and pushed it well on the road towards a legitimate civilization.

But it must not be supposed from what we have said, that the problem of humanity was neglected by the ancients. It was natural for man, with his aspirations, with the certainty of death before him, and his longing for immortality, to enquire into the destiny that awaited him. The Egyptian priests, the Persian Magi, the Indian Brahmins, asked, like the Hebrew prophet, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" True, many of their theories of mind and immortality were imperfect, and some would create a smile on the face of the modern philosopher; but they give evidence of a careful study of the whole subject, and a thorough digestion of all the facts then known, which show that they were not the capricious imaginings of unbalanced intellects, but constituted, on the other hand, a system of philosophy so intricate and so carefully arranged, and withal containing so

many truths, that they must, as a whole, forever command respect, while those who framed them will receive the consideration to which their great learning entitled them. They were the master minds of their day, the great contributors to the civilization of their age.

The civilizing forces are manifestly four: the physical, the intellectual, the religious, and the moral. All changes in the condition of society are wrought by one of these; and it is the province of the student of mankind to investigate the relative power of each, and the manner in which each operates upon the other. The subject will admit of no positive conclusions. Mind is self-acting, as far as it knows how to control the laws of nature; it is subject to physical influences, in proportion as it is ignorant of these laws, and of the manner in which they are susceptible of control.

Mind is a power within itself; matter is inert and passive, and must be acted upon. To act thus is within the power of mind; but to accomplish anything, the laws of matter itself must be carefully observed. The will cannot check the surge upon the beach; but through the laws of mechanics, those same waves can be met, and rolled back, by piers and walls; and geological discovery proves this through the application of the laws of matter. The Divine Mind checked and placed bounds to the waves, when he said, "Thus far, &c." The strongest will could not give motion to an atom by arbitrary determination; but apply the forces which govern matter, and mountains can be removed.

The Divine Mind does nothing arbitrarily; and the universe is controlled and governed because that great Central Intellect has perfect command of those laws, in all their operations alike in the greatest and minutest particulars; by the chemical and mechanical forces the substance which constitutes our globe was consolidated and arranged; by gravitation and centripetal power, the planets perform their evolutions; and the wider our acquaintance with science, the more numerous are the evidences which accumulate to prove this fact; to prove that the Creator accomplishes his work only by the application of the laws of matter. Certainly, man can effect nothing by any other means.

Accepting this to be true, then the sum of any particular civilization is the result of: 1st, the action of nature upon mind; and 2d, of the action of mind upon nature. Every region will produce a civilization suitable to its climate, soil,

productions, location, scenery, etc., just as it produces certain habits in the lower animals which roam about it; and if there were no intellectual forces, if man were not capable of studying the phenomena of nature, discovering its laws, and by his knowledge availing himself of them to react upon the physical forces, we should find him with habits as fixed as those of the brute.

The physical causes which operate are few; but they are fixed, and when not counterpoised by the mental, exercise an absolute control; and consequently their effects can be read with almost mathematical accuracy, by studying the habits of tribes possessing an indigenous civilization; tribes which migrated to a particular place before they had made any material advances in knowledge. On the other hand, as we survey the complicated social and political systems of the world; as we observe the vast improvements in every branch of industry; as we listen to the steam-whistle, observe the waterfall turned into a motive power, and peruse the messages conveyed by the magnetic telegraph—we read the triumphs of mind, and discover some of the things it is capable of accomplishing, if it but understand the laws of nature, and avails itself of its knowledge. By his improvements, man is enabled to counteract and modify the physical forces; by the felling of forests, the draining of lakes, the construction of dykes and levees, the climate of whole regions has been modified materially; through a knowledge of the chemical properties of certain articles, soils have been entirely changed, and a revolution wrought in the character of production; and as the science of agricultural chemistry is yet in its infancy, changes will take place greater than any that have yet occurred; by the construction of artificial harbors, or the improvement of natural ones possessing few advantages, the industrial pursuits of a whole community may be thoroughly revolutionized; and to be more general, with the application of every new discovery comes a change in the current civilization—that change always according in magnitude to the importance of the discovery itself.

Man at his creation was evidently in the lowest conceivable condition, so far as intellectual acquirements were concerned; therefore the physical forces operated, with almost unmodified sway, in controlling his destinies; and in each particular locality, a civilization, adapted to itself, grew up; and peculiar characteristics, through long and constant operations of certain forces, were stamped upon the different na-

tionalities; stamped so indelibly upon some, that races disappear with any revolution in their surroundings, a phenomenon which possesses its best illustration in the aborigines of America, who found as deadly an enemy in the missionary who would civilize, as in the warrior who would slay him.

In discussing the subject of civilization, it becomes necessary to analyze each of the four forces: the effect of physical surroundings, the tendency of religious teachings, the strength of moral precepts, and the power of the intellect; for the sum of all civilization is but the product of these forces acting upon man and upon one another; and the character of society is an index of the relative strength of each as an impelling power in their operations upon any particular race or nationality.

The powers of nature are chiefly confined to these: climate, soil, production, scenery, and locality; and these naturally involve numerous permutations, each of which is productive of different results, and gives rise to a different civilization. Each element has certain absolute tendencies, but they never act singly; and these tendencies are the same, whether operating upon a savage or a cultivated man; but the effect upon the latter is comparatively trifling, because the force is met by another, the intellectual, which wards it off if deleterious, or adds to its strength if advantageous; while the former is little else than an automaton, moving as he is moved.

One of the first and most prominent effects of a torrid climate is almost universal enervation. No race in its infancy ever withstood its influence; and it is very difficult to conceive of a civilization so perfect as to counteract them, though we will not assert that such a one is impossible. There is no man, residing in a climate where there is even a brief torrid term, but has experienced the enervating influences of heat, notwithstanding that he may be braced up by months of cold and other months of delightful temperature. The influence, in this respect, is so universal, that it can be seen in its operation upon the individual, as well as on the nation or the race.

The consequences which naturally follow would not be difficult to decipher, even if we had no example, no record of past events. Feeling a natural disinclination to any species of exertion, the inhabitants of the tropics would do nothing save that which was demanded by their immediate

necessities. They would procure subsistence, and were compelled to put forth the necessary energies to procure it; but of clothing they needed little, and hence, when the food for the day was collected, they reposed beneath the palm-tree's shade, until again driven forth to seek their scanty meal. Except to shelter them from the torrents that fall in profusion during half the year, houses were not demanded; they sought coolness, not warmth; desired protection from the rays of the sun, and not against the blasts of winter; and no structures which art could rear could furnish this so perfectly as the dense tree-tops of the tropical forest.

In his primitive state, then, the amount of exertion required to procure food was the measure of that put forth by the inhabitants of the torrid climate; and as seasons did not materially change, as nature spread forth its bounty equally each day, there was no necessity for the exercise of foresight in laying up stores, and none ever characterized his career. He lived for the day, and thought not of the morrow, well knowing that it had its bounties, for which he had but to stretch forth his hand to be satisfied.

It is easy to understand how this indolence would contribute to build up, at a very early day, a society of men wedded to a particular locality, a people adverse to migration, wherever the soil was sufficiently productive to furnish all that the appetite required. In cold latitudes, the human constitution demands meat, to supply caloric to the system; and without it, in extreme northern regions, a race would soon become extinct. The fat of the whale, the seal, and the walrus, which, if taken into the stomach of the Hindoo, would create nausea, and produce death if used long as a dietetic, is essential to the very life of the Esquimaux; a single winter, with no other food than the rice and fruits upon which the inhabitants of South Asia subsist, would suffice to render the North Greenlanders extinct. The only province of food in torrid regions, is to supply fibre; this the vegetable kingdom does most bountifully; while it generates but a small amount of caloric. For that the man of the south needs only the climate—in that he finds a superabundance. Men only crave animal food when their constitutions require it; hence the inhabitant of the tropics consumes his meal of rice and fruit, and is satisfied. Nor is the quantity demanded large. Four causes operate to render him content with but a small portion of the sustenance necessary to the health of the northern man. The first is, that

already referred to; his food is necessary to perform but a single function—supply fibre; while in the north it must also form a reservoir for caloric, and hence a less quantity is demanded in one case than in the other. There are, perhaps, few, even on the borders of the northern lakes, but have noticed a decline in their appetites during the summer months; and also, that food which in winter is perfectly healthy, gives rise to bilious effects in July and August. The second cause, operating to diminish the quantity of nourishment required, is the prevailing idleness. The man of the tropic is indolent, and takes little exercise; the exhaustion which labor produces, he never experiences; the fibre supplied by his food, does not require reproduction so rapidly as in the north, where every man is a laborer; and the result is, the appetite is not ravenous, and the stomach is satisfied with a trifle of vegetable diet.

The tropical regions are divided into two classes: rich, loamy lands, and sandy or mountainous deserts. There is little surface that is not included in one of these categories—little that is a medium between them. There is either a prolific growth of vegetation, or universal destitution. Nature either bountifully supplies all, while man reposes, or it denies even to the hand of industry its legitimate reward.

With a natural distaste for any species of exertion, the primitive inhabitant of the sultry regions, bordering on water-courses, where nature is bountiful, is not long in acquiring a few fixed habits, and he soon locates in a particular spot, and is averse to roaming abroad. The region around him supplies all that his nature demands, and he has not yet learned the luxury of intellectual food. He is satisfied, and why roam at large? He cannot find a soil more prolific; therefore he throws around him a few simple comforts, and remains where his ancestors lived before him. It was in these climates; it was on the water-courses of India, Western Asia, and Northern Africa, that the earliest traces of civilization were found; and it was from these that the germ sprang which led to the regeneration of Northern and Western Europe.

It is a law of population, that it increases most rapidly where production is most abundant; and we may naturally conclude that not many centuries intervened, after the fertile regions of Southern Asia and the valley of the Nile received their first colonists, before the population became dense, and new migrations were a necessity; for none would take place

till the supply of food was exhausted, and inadequate to the sustenance of the people. This exhaustion of the capacity of the soil in its natural state, was productive of two results—migrations, and the application of art to stimulate the growth of food. It is highly probable that the former alternative was accepted first; as the exertion required was less than that demanded by agriculture in its most primitive state. Besides, many of the migrations were very gradual, until a whole region was occupied as far as its mountain or desert boundaries; and it was only then that the sacrifices demanded of the surplus population, who were compelled to migrate, were indeed great, and sometimes perilous. But even then, it is probable, long journeys across wide sandy plains were undertaken, before yet the plough penetrated the soil; for a superabundance of population naturally led to contention and war; and as long as the weaker party could find new homes, they preferred flight to servitude.

It was only when the boundaries of indigenous production had been reached on all sides, that the hand of man was applied to the stimulation of production. Nor would any willingly labor for himself; but, when contentions ensued, the vanquished, having no asylum, as his ancestors had, in other luxuriant valleys, naturally either fled to the desert or the mountain, or submitted to a life of servitude, and became the first tiller of the soil.

He who took up his abode on the sandy plain, as did the Arab, was compelled to strain every nerve to procure food. His wild, wandering life, beneath an enervating sun, was imperiously demanded. Let him reach a spot where a caravan is encamped beneath the shady trees of some fertile oasis, and beside a spring of cooling water, and he will consume the last morsel of the plunder he captures before he again sets forth in his wanderings, showing that he, too, were he on the banks of the Nile, would be as indolent as the Egyptian who now dwells there.

The primitive man does not generalize on the abstract question of freedom; he desires to be himself unrestrained, but cares not for the fate of others. Under such circumstances, the strong and the intellectual naturally enslaved the weak; and this process, once commenced, always leads to a continued diminution of the number of masters and the increase of the number of serfs. Property accumulates in the hands of those who wield the greatest amount of capital; small farms, even where men are well disposed to labor, are

speedily swallowed up in large ones; and the late freeholders are either compelled to retire elsewhere, or become paupers or slaves. Hence it was that all the early civilizations ripened into untempered despotisms.

Against the theory that the people of tropical latitudes are indisposed to exertion, it has been frequently urged that in the heated regions of Asia and Africa are indisputable records of an industry scarcely equalled anywhere; we are pointed to the pyramids of Egypt, and the colossal remains of India, Assyria, and Persia, and many regard these citations as conclusive arguments. But not so. The power of the monarch rendered him the absolute master of his subjects, and these were dragged to the public works, as they were dragged into the army. All the labor performed was compulsory; and such was the intellectual enervation, that the masses preferred to toil beneath the rod, rather than put forth the exertion and vigilance necessary to be free and to retain freedom, even though they had understood anything of the abstract question of liberty. Synonymous cases are seen daily among ourselves in this age and country. Thousands of men who could, by putting forth even moderate exertions, amass a competence, which would enable them to assume an independence, prefer always to labor, however distasteful toil may be, just enough to procure themselves the absolute necessaries of life, and remain dependents during manhood, and die paupers. In tropical climates, this nerveless class embraces well-nigh the entire population; and thus the way is open for exceptions to render themselves masters and their countrymen slaves.

But to establish society on the basis which we find were those of South Asia four or five thousand years since, required a long period of time. It was not till a sparse population of fugitives had been spread abroad throughout the greater portion of the world, yet sufficiently strong to meet and drive back other fugitives, that civilization began to assume a definite form in the torrid localities of Asia and Africa.

Having migrated at a period when the people of their native regions were yet barbarous, the inhabitants of the northern sections of Asia and Europe transferred to their new abodes few of the elements of civilization; and the country being unfitted to its indigenous growth, the people continued in their primitive state, while the demands of nature were so imperious that they were compelled to be continually on the alert to provide for future contingencies,

and they necessarily became wanderers, migrating continually to new and fresh hunting-grounds, or new pastoral lands.

Wherever nature supplies an abundance from day to day, man does not take the trouble to provide for more than the passing hour. This characteristic is plainly exhibited in Southern Europe at this time. The Italian or the Spaniard has nothing in his house at evening to supply his coming morning's meal. This is true, as the traveller well knows, even in the largest hotels of Naples and Cadiz; and anything which intervenes to shut off the diurnal bounty of nature is the signal for a general fast, and perhaps a general famine.

Tropical heat having the effect, at all times, to produce laxity and aversion to exertion, no man, as has been previously remarked, ever labors, either mentally or physically, more than is necessary to meet absolute present wants. Therefore, the inhabitants of heated climates are seldom reasoners—they only occasionally think. On the other hand, everything around them is well calculated to stimulate the imagination. The scenery is gorgeous, the flora is on the grandest scale; their own blood is always heated, and hence they are given to continued outbursts of passion; they are poets by nature, and their language, the outgrowth of their character, is replete with superlatives, and they illustrate only by figures of speech—they are captivated solely by grand displays. The architecture of all the higher civilizations, in a torrid climate, is on a towering scale; their religion consists not in sermons upon abstract theology or practical morals, but in processions, colossal churches, mosques, and pagodas.

An acute observer and learned traveller, in speaking of eastern exaggeration and sublimity, said, that one naturally became a poet on learning Arabic; and the same remark will apply to all of the refined tropical languages. Words are employed to express ideas, and as language is the creation of a principle, it naturally assumes a character best calculated to meet their demands. In heated latitudes, all nature is a volume of poetry, and inspires in the observer ideas of grandeur which are strange to the stolid reasoner of the north, and as were the impressions received, so was the growth of the language through which ideas were expressed.

But the very circumstances which rendered the civilization of the tropics the first, also made it the most imperfect of all, and prevented it from assuming that progressive type which is characteristic of that of the North. It is the work of outer impressions almost exclusively.

pasturage, war, and the chase, they had no fixed habitations. Men acquire everything by degrees. When an obstacle presents itself, if it is but trifling, the mind sets about to overcome it; and having done so, it is not daunted by one a shade greater. But let the first be such as only the higher order of civilization can overcome, and the savage mind never permits himself to encounter it. In the tropics, where agriculture was needed, the most simple labor would be productive of results; but in Britain, Germany, Poland, and the north of France, a comparatively high order of agricultural knowledge was demanded before any return could be realized by the laborer; and as a consequence, indigenous civilization was next to impossible. The step from the hunter to the agriculturist was too long to be taken, unless instruction came from abroad.

Population, too, which usually keeps pace with production, did not increase rapidly; it might, possibly, in time, have forced a civilization; but centuries must have intervened before the inhabitants would have made any very material progress towards a stable society.

But that which rendered the people incapable of making rapid advances in the direction of civilization, without some extraneous influences, was highly favorable to its growth when once the seed was planted. The long winters had rendered provision for the future necessary to the very existence of man. The heat had not unnerved him as it had the Arab of the desert; and instead of action being distasteful, aversion to it was a subject of scorn. The activity was not only physical, but likewise necessarily mental, though the imaginations were not excited, and the passions were cooled. While the southern man surrounded himself with a seraglio, and indulged in all the luxuries supplied by bounteous nature, and found only happiness in the gratification of his appetites and propensities, the mind of the man of the north was occupied with providing for the long winter which confronted him. He could have made no provision for a score of wives, and being mental, rather than animal, he naturally reasoned that, as the sexes were nearly equal in number, polygamy and cicisbeism were contrary to nature; and whether or not positively prohibited by law from doing so, the inhabitant of the temperate zones seldom practised them. Female virtue, too, which is almost unknown in the tropics, was respected; and one who was unchaste, was infamous.

The people of temperate climates, then, being athletic,

active, cool, virtuous, and mental, were eminently prepared to advance to a higher and far more perfect civilization than that of those who had been impelled to abandon a savage life by physical influences merely, and whose only intellectual efforts were those spontaneous outbursts of imagination which may produce the gigantic and the grand, but which seldom achieve much that is practical and useful. Were the entire population of the globe swept away, and a new race substituted, its antiquaries, in searching among the works which would survive their constructors, would find in Europe and America remains of railroads, docks, and factories; in Egypt, the pyramids; and in Asia, grand temples and gigantic pillars.

The savage of the temperate latitudes, then, possessed all the inherent forces necessary for rapid progress; his mind was already active, and only needed direction; and that came from mingling with the Romans and Greeks, both as vanquished and victors. As soon as the man of the north had assumed the habits of civilized life, and possessed fixed habitations, his active mind impelled him to study the means of improving his condition. That which made him, as a wandering marauder, the terror of the man of the south, now rendered him the energetic tiller of the soil, or the adventurous mariner. He had once been the conqueror of man; he now became the subduer of nature, and his conquests are shown in every branch of industry, and have been carried to every portion of the habitable globe.

The active man is self-reliant; therefore each individual member of society struggled with every other for precedence. No man, consequently, would yield his liberty without a powerful necessity; and then would yield only so far as was imperatively demanded, and would struggle to regain what he had lost, the moment it was possible to do so.

The feudal system grew up in Europe from the unsettled state of society, but it passed away with a removal of the causes which produced it; and the agitation in behalf of liberty is continuous, and will only close when man is permitted to enjoy all the rights to which he is entitled by the gift of his Creator. These revolutions are the work of centuries; but the tendency of the physical forces is always visible, though their operations may be aided or retarded by the mental forces.

Nor was this all which favored the development of an intellectual civilization. There was little in northern scenery

to inspire awe, and comparatively little in the phenomena of nature to create terror. Men usually ascribe everything out of the usual routine, to the immediate and direct intervention of Providence; if advantageous, to its beneficence; if otherwise, to its anger. There is scarcely a year, or even a month, but the tropics are visited by calamities, by tornadoes, floods, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, &c., while in temperate latitudes these are almost unknown. The seasons pass merging almost imperceptibly each into the succeeding; and, whether the laws are understood or not, man surrounded by such routine naturally forms a conception of the attributes of Deity, entirely different from that of the inhabitant of the tropics.

It is impossible for a mind that has made any advances in knowledge to witness long the continued recurrence of a certain class of events, without attributing their regularity to fixed laws, and his attention is immediately directed to their nature, and the manner of their operation. Some of the sciences, it is true, flourished early in the nations of tropical Asia; but they were few, and the investigations were confined to those phenomena which were of a regular character. When Alexander the Great entered Babylon, he found astronomical calculations dating back as far as 1903 years before Christ; but they only referred to the movements of the heavenly bodies, which are readily perceived to be periodical, and which early attracted the attention of the shepherds, on the plains, while watching their flocks; comets, meteors, and the like, were looked upon as exceptions—as occasional ebullitions of Divine anger.

When once it is established that one thing is the result of fixed laws, the mind naturally enquires if other phenomena, not so entirely regular, are not also governed by similar principles, and not the result of caprice; and thus, from one point to another, men are led to reason, until they cannot other than conclude, that while Mind is the governing power of the universe, it never operates save through fixed and immutable laws.

Thus it was that the man of the north was the first to carry investigations into every department of nature; to reject the idea that storms and floods, and volcanoes and earthquakes, were evidences of Divine wrath; but to ascribe them to certain causes, or to a combination of causes, that ever must produce like results. His mind was not continually terrified by the presence of these convulsions of nature, and he viewed

them, as a disinterested party views the quarrels of nations, from a philosophical stand-point.

Another circumstance which is calculated to cherish the growth of an intellectual civilization in the north, whenever fixed habits have been attained by a people, is the fact that all the labor for the year, among agriculturalists, must be performed within the period of a few months; and hence the ingenuity is taxed to the utmost to provide for the long and dreary winters. This is productive of perpetual activity during the summer months, when the heat might incline one to relax his exertions; while the inclemency of the frigid season will not permit him, during that period, to become effeminate, though he can perform no physical labor in the open air. Boreal breezes are too inspiring to tolerate indolence; and half the year the man of the north is solely given over to his family, and to his thoughts; and while his attachments to those around him are less intense than those of the passionate man of the tropics, they are more enduring, because regulated by reason and a sense of duty. He corrects his child in his calmer moments, and for its benefit; while the southerner beats his when in a passion, until the sufferer is exhausted, and then repents, and as a recompense, allows it a license which is at once destructive of all the respect which is due the parent.

The southern man, controlled by his imagination and stimulated passions, loves, hates, and acts without reason; the northern man, cold as the atmosphere he breathes, is ever moderate, and can smother his resentment. The stiletto is an instrument peculiar to heated climates; assassinations for revenge are rare in the north; in the south they are a delightful pastime.

All schemes for the gradual amelioration of society are of northern origin. The southern man can, it is true, be so oppressed as to be aroused to resistance; but, as in all things else, his movements are without system; he acts with a terrible energy, and visits a fearful retribution upon his oppressors. The dagger, the guillotine, and the rack are his weapons; the innocent and the guilty are alike his victims; but possessing no self-control, when his resentment has been sated he sits down again, the worshipper and the instrument of a tyrant as cruel as the one overthrown. Revolutions in the south are more frequent than in the north; but they result in the end only in a change of masters, while in the north every convulsion benefits democracy and liberty.

The long winters of the north are the parents of its mechanics, its inventors, its artists, its literati, and its philosophers. With time in abundance to devote to thought, with a mind energized by the cold winds, with the activity inspired by the demands made upon the ingenuity during the summer in order that complete protection against the effects of winter might be secured, and with no opportunity to consume the time in frivolous out-door amusements, each intellect was engaged in active labor. The mass of men devoted their attention to devising plans for their material comforts, which they put in execution in the summer months, and thus gave rise to material prosperity; while not a few directed their minds to the cultivation of literature, art, science, and philosophy; and thus an intellectual civilization was developed, of a character entirely different from that which resulted in the south, from almost purely physical agencies; and which is, we believe, destined to be permanent, and to yet regenerate and intellectualize society within the tropics. If the development of mind is sufficiently great to enable it to control the forces of nature, by counteracting the deleterious, and stimulating the beneficial forces, then we may yet expect the regeneration of the countries which were seats of ancient civilization, and may confidently look to such a reorganization of the social system of the people, as will give them, if not their former splendor, far more than their former usefulness and solidity.

But climate and soil are not the only physical influences which aid in shaping a primitive civilization, and, of course, giving direction to the expanding intellect. The destinies of a people are often decided by locality; and between two families of the same race there exists a wide diversity, as early as the second and third generations, after a dispersion, if their new homes invite different modes of life.

To almost every pursuit there are certain peculiarities attaching themselves. Where occupations are varied and the people mingle freely these peculiarities are little marked; but, as is generally the case, yet nearly all, or a vast majority, in one particular locality, adopt a single pursuit, and these will be at once apparent and permanent; and this remark obtains greater force where we find a nation with one predominating interest. It can be observed readily even in the idiomatic language of a people, which naturally derives phrases and illustrations from the technical terms of the dominant occupations, and it is still more readily seen in the prevailing architecture, tastes, and habits.

Commercial cities, manufacturing towns, villages of fishermen, and rural districts, each possess certain characteristics not found in the others; in a word, each have a civilization of their own, and while this is in some measure the result of intellectual development, that received its direction from physical causes, from the fact that there were fine harbors, waterfalls, schools of fish, or a fertile soil, gave the original direction to the pursuits in which men were engaged.

The more primitive the race at the period of dispersion, the more rapidly will this diversity manifest itself, because the physical forces lose power as the mental are developed. The tendency of intellect is towards unity in end, but variety in means; it possesses the power, when developed, to supply deficiencies, which nature can never do; therefore, wherever it prevails, the same ultimate end, self-elevation, is sought, while it resorts to every conceivable artifice within the limits of any one particular locality. Nevertheless, the constant action of physical causes will leave many traces of their effects. This can readily be illustrated in the case of a body put in motion by a single force; if on the way it encounters another coming at an angle, it will deviate from a straight line, and the deviation will be in proportion to the relative momentum of the two bodies. The mental forces are moving in a direct line onwards, while the physical are perpetually compelling a deviation from that direct course.

History is replete with illustrations of the effect of locality upon a people. The inhabitants of all the peninsulas, and those on the shores of the Mediterranean, where there were excellent harbors, and where the interior produced a liberal supply of articles demanded at a distance, were adventurers on the sea. The Danes and the Norwegians, on the inlets of the North Sea, were pirates from time immemorial, till their profession was superseded by peaceful commerce, in which they engaged with ardor. The narrow limits which circumscribed the Dutch, sent them to the seas early, and for a long time they held a commercial supremacy. The narrow policy of British monarchs for a period kept England a purely agricultural country; but centuries have intervened since the demands of the people compelled a change, and Great Britain, possessing every advantage of locality, and all the material for carrying on manufactories successfully, became the mistress of the ocean, and the chief of commercial nations.

We have an example in our own country. The New England States abounded in harbors and waterfalls, and hence commercial cities and manufacturing towns have sprung up in quick succession, though a region whose climate is inhospitable, and whose soil is chiefly barren; and hence the civilization of New England is such as follows the pursuits indicated, in a word, obtains its direction from its physical surroundings. But the civilization of that section is preponderatingly intellectual, and therefore does not possess peculiarities so distinct as would have followed had intellectual culture been exclusively the property of the few, as is the case in the manufacturing districts of Europe.

To pursue the subject further would be to extend this article to too great a length. Yet the reader will perceive that but one branch of the subject, the effect of physical causes, has been touched. The counteraction of the mental forces, and how they have affected the destiny of man, open a still wider theme than the one here discussed; therefore it would be impossible to broach the subject in this article. We have already shown how certain climates and localities are adapted to the development of the intellectual forces; but these developments introduced a new power into the arena, which reacts on nature. Whether it will be able to ultimately overcome all the physical causes which operate deleteriously upon civilization, is a problem for the distant future.

ART. III.—*Reports of the Supreme Court, and other Public Documents, &c.* WASHINGTON, 1836–1864.

THE Supreme Court of the United States may well be proud of its chief-justices. All of them were eminent, and three were distinguished. Jay, doubtless, had less legal learning than Marshall or Taney. Coming into public life in 1774, at the age of twenty-nine, and being engaged almost constantly, from that time up to the adoption of the Constitution, in the most important public employments at home and abroad, he had less opportunity for legal studies and pursuits than the others, at the same period of their lives. Nevertheless he was unquestionably the most suitable man in the country to be the first Chief-Justice. His great abilities, his calm temper, his love of justice, his immaculate purity, and the universal confidence of the country in him—

all conspired to designate him as the fittest occupant of that high position. Ellsworth, his immediate successor, was an able and suitable man for the station; but he filled it at an early and comparatively unimportant epoch, and for a short period only. He had no opportunity of gaining any special distinction as a judge.

Next came Marshall, the very impersonation of law and logic. He was the best man who could have succeeded to that place. He laid broad and deep the foundations of our national legal system; he was the early and the greatest expounder of the Constitution. During an eventful period of thirty-four years, he reared a splendid structure of American public law. When Taney succeeded to that fabric, it was in a somewhat finished condition. If he only kept good the old homestead, he performed a memorable work. If he added anything of grace, beauty, or substance to the structure, his fame rises all the higher in the scale of greatness. No country in any period of the world's history—not France or England in their greatest days—could boast a judicial name superior to that of the great architect of our constitutional law. No country was ever more fortunate in having the mantle of a great chief fall upon a worthy successor. Marshall was clear, simple, exact, acute, comprehensive, logical, original, and profound. Taney was, perhaps, second to Marshall in some, if not in all, these points; and yet he was a great judge and a great man.

He has now gone where neither praise nor blame can reach him; yet he may properly be brought before the tribunal of public judgment for his administration of his great trust. At the bar, on the presentation of resolutions of condolence and respect, no rigorous criticism of merit or demerit is expected. It is true that good taste would recommend such treatment; but custom has established a law of eulogy in such cases, from which it is perhaps too late to expect a departure. The newspaper press indulges in unstinted laudation, or unmeasured abuse, according as party prejudice leads. Popular judgment must necessarily be somewhat divided and somewhat unsound. Professional opinion, too, partakes of the popular fever. But a calmer judgment and a more thoughtful review are demanded in these pages. A brief outline of his life, an examination of his public career—free from the taint of politics on either side—and an attempt at a critical analysis of his mental constitution, are no more than justice to the memory of the great magistrate.

Roger B. Taney was a native of Calvert county, Maryland. He was born March 17th, 1777. His ancestry need not be traced; and his life, although an active and illustrious one, affords few incidents of remarkable adventure for extensive biography. He was educated at Dickinson College, and graduated in 1795. He commenced legal practice in his native place in 1799; but in 1801 removed to Frederic. He was early a member of the lower house of the state legislature, and state senator from 1816 to 1822. In 1822 he removed to Baltimore. He was appointed State Attorney-General in 1827, and held the station until March, 1831, when he was made United States Attorney-General. This place he held until September, 1833, when he was transferred to the Treasury Department, which he held until he was created Chief-Justice, in March, 1836. He died in office on the 12th October, 1864, at the city of Washington.

As a lawyer at the bar, Taney was not eloquent, nor impassioned; but he was solid, strong, and persuasive. As long since as 1825, he was the first lawyer in his state; and the bar of that state was second to none in the country. Robert Goodloe Harper and William Pinkney had died, leaving Taney without a peer. In 1829, William Wirt, after twelve years of brilliant service as attorney-general of the United States, removed to Baltimore, and became the rival of Taney. The contest was a spirited, but a decisive one. Wirt was the more polished, eloquent, and scholarly man; but Taney brought the logic of a giant to bear upon the beautiful creations of the rhetorical artist. He more than sustained himself in the conflict; he brought out of it a reputation increased, rather than diminished.

Among the more prominent men with whom he came in contact in professional life, were Winder, Harper, Martin, Pinkney, and Wirt. He was equal to any one of them, though differing in the leading traits of his mind from each. Winder was a very superior lawyer. Taney was a man of more ability and culture than Goodloe Harper. He himself was accustomed to speak of Luther Martin as the ablest of the men of his professional days. The chief-justice was, however, so averse to speaking of himself, that he seldom, even to his most intimate friends, indulged in reminiscences of his earlier life. Pinkney was the superior of Martin in elegance, polish, and eloquence; also in knowledge of political law; but in all other respects, the chief-justice always spoke of Martin as the abler and more learned man.

In the public jurisprudence of the United States there has been established a table-land of professional eminence, occupied by such men as Pinkney, Martin, Wirt, Mason, Webster, not to mention later names of the living. Taney is, in some respects, liable to a comparison with them. Webster was certainly his superior as an orator and a judicial advocate, but it is doubtful whether he could ever have been so great a chief-justice. Pinkney was more elaborately learned in his profession, and more elegantly cultivated out of it. He had some defects which detracted from his merits as a lawyer, and which rendered it improbable that he was entirely fitted for the highest judicial station. Martin was more learned in his profession than Pinkney, but less accomplished out of it. He never had any opportunity for the exhibition of judicial ability. But there can be no question that he would have succeeded as a judge. Mason was a man of the highest order of ability as a jurist; learned, original, acute, and logical; but the most of his life was spent in local tribunals. If the credit which has been generally accorded to him is deserved, he only required the same fields of labor to have ranked as the peer of Marshall and Taney.

It is not a matter of wonder that so able a judge of merit as President Jackson should have discovered in the leader of the bar of Baltimore a man worthy of public advancement, and competent for public service. In June, 1831, he conferred upon Mr. Taney the best office in the executive department of the government for a genuine lawyer, that of attorney-general. This post Taney held until September of 1833, when he was transferred to the treasury. He held the place of law officer of the government but a little over two years; but it was long enough to establish his fame firmly among the ablest lawyers who have adorned that place. His connection with the treasury was, at the time, made a subject of political attack; but history has since vindicated him, and also the great leader with whom he served. Taney was through life incapable of doing a dishonest act for personal aggrandizement: Jackson was incapable of asking such a sacrifice of any man.

The principal event connected with his administration of the treasury, was the removal of the government deposits from the United States Bank to the state banks. At this time Taney shared with Jackson much of party obloquy. At this later day it may be conceded that the act was a somewhat high-handed one; still the motive and the con-

duct of the secretary are abundantly cleared of all inte
tional assumption of illegal power. His right to remo
the public funds in case of their manifest peril, exis
ed by virtue of the 16th section of the Charter of t
United States Bank. Taney, in his official capacity a
attorney-general, had given to the executive an opinion
favor of both the right and the expediency of a remova
When Mr. Duane refused to obey the President's order, a
the executive tendered the appointment to Taney, it could n
be a matter of doubt whether he should accept. It w
simply a question of duty in assuming the necessary respo
sibility connected with his previously expressed offici
opinion. It is due to historical truth to state, that after a
the fury of party wrath had been poured upon the head
the secretary, when his name was subsequently present
to the Senate for confirmation in the office of chief-justic
John Davis, of Massachusetts, and others voted in his favo
on the ground that he was the fittest man that was likely
be put in nomination. This sufficiently demonstrated th
even his enemies had confidence in his personal and offici
integrity.

But distinguished as had been the previous career of M
Taney, its crowning epoch began when he became chie
justice. Jay and Marshall had preceded him,and made th
place illustrious. His immediate predecessor had made it
dangerous place to be occupied by any man of less than t
first order of judicial capacity. Chief-Justice Taney, f
twenty-eight years, kept good the established fame of th
great tribunal. All in this country felt that a safe, wis
learned, and honest chief was at the head of the America
judiciary. England and the Continent recognised in him
worthy successor of Marshall, a more than equal associa
of Story, and a magistrate worthy to rank by the side of t
Hardwickes, the D'Angessans, and the Mansfields of histor

The office of chief-justice of the United States is a pec
liar judicial station, and differs materially from that of chie
justice in England. It combines the functions of the chie
justice, the chancellor, and the chief-judge in admiralt
in Great Britain. The office of a chief-justice here is t
more important also, not only for the reason that our syste
of government gives rise to most important constitution
questions of power between the states and the nation, but fro
the further fact that both state and national governments a
limited in their powers by precise written constitution

Marshall derived most of his fame from these great questions, and Taney's best opinions were on this class of topics, whereas, in England they have no such constitutional questions, because parliament is considered omnipotent. The courts there have, therefore, only to administer the common law, interpret and apply acts of parliament, international law, and public treaties.

Our space will not permit us elaborately to dissect Taney's mental constitution; still less to trace his intellect as displayed in the many important decisions which are recorded under his name. His mind was comprehensive, acute, and logical; not brilliant, imaginative, or impulsive. This eminently fitted him for the judicial function. In learning he was highly respectable, but he relied more upon himself than his library for correct legal conclusions. His patience in listening, his calmness in weighing, his candor, care, and independence in deciding, were the admiration of the bar. A serious and hearty love of legal truth, and a stern and unflinching devotion to legal justice, were the great moral characteristics of the man. The highest guarantee of legal justice was afforded the American people, when a great constitutional question was argued in the Supreme Court, and decided by Taney and his associates.

Great as he was, and strong as he was felt to be, he is said to have never been dictatorial or arbitrary with his associates, but the youngest man upon the bench was allowed the full weight of his opinions. In the conduct of his court he was a pattern of a dignified chief-justice. There was no pert colloquy with the bar, no hasty interruptions or rude suggestions. All was calm, deferential, and judicial. He seemed to sit upon that high bench the very embodiment of justice, its even scales severely poised.

He relied on principles, rather than on precedents. He was more of a legal philosopher than a case lawyer. His legal common sense was worth more than a library of text-books. His services to constitutional, international, commercial, and patent law will be the admiration of the future historian of the Supreme Court.

The mental constitution of the chief-justice admirably fitted him for the judicial office. The intellectual qualities appropriate to judicial greatness, are peculiar. There are forensic, oratorical, executive, and judicial greatness, each distinct in its attributes. The great judicial character, suited to such a position as American chief-justice, must

combine integrity, patience, acuteness, logical vigor, firmness without pride of opinion, comprehensive grasp, and accurate learning. A capacity to preside is also highly desirable, if not absolutely necessary. A nice judicial balance of mind is more than all needed. This enables the great judge to view both sides, to distinguish and decide impartially, rather than to assume a side and defend it. This last is forensic, rather than judicial genius.

There are certain approved standards of judicial excellence by which a great national judge is tested in the popular mind; such as great penetration, analysis, comprehension, quickness, integrity, impartiality, equanimity, learning. He who possesses these in combination, is considered a first-class magistrate; he who lacks some important one, or who lacks the combination, must take his place in a second, third, or fourth rank. In which must Taney be classed? is a natural enquiry. No one will claim that we should give to this enquiry any larger scope than whether he was a first-class man; or, rather, the first of a second class of men? Taney's reputation as a public man, is that of a jurist, rather than a legislator or statesman. His life was, for the most part, devoted to the law, either in its practice or its administration. He figures much less in official political life than either Jay or Marshall. It is, therefore. with the great jurists of the world that he must be compared.

The materials from which to portray the chief-justice, although somewhat varied, are uncertain guides. The great merit of any description of such a man must consist in its individuality and truthfulness. All marked men differ in their leading qualities; it is the business of criticism to depict those peculiarities. The means of judging him may be summed up as consisting of the books of his recorded opinions, the testimony of those who practised before him, who were on familiar terms with him, and who sat by his side.

The volumes of the reports of the Supreme Court do not afford an absolute record of Taney's merits, or any adequate conception of the extent of his labors. It was the custom of Marshall to draw up most of the more elaborate opinions on great constitutional questions. Taney, on the contrary, for some reason, exhibited no partiality whatever in that respect. There was, however, an unambitious field which he was accustomed to occupy—that of the opinions upon questions of practice. These he almost invariably drew up. The reason of this is reported to have been that, constituted as the Fed-

deral courts were, he considered it of great importance that the practice should be uniform, fixed, and correct. The reasons for his abstinence in drawing up the more elaborate opinions upon great questions, have been variously assigned. His feeble health, it is said, disabled him for those tedious investigations of authority which would be essential in writing such opinions. It has also been said, that he was surrounded by younger and more ambitious judges, who coveted the importance that attaches to the writing of opinions, and that, to secure his influence with such, he deemed it well to defer to their aspirations. Neither of these considerations could have much influenced his conduct. Nor is it probable that indolence had any connection whatever with it. It is more probable that it was either accidental, or else that his natural modesty never permitted him for a moment to think of the figure he was to make in the volumes of Court Reports during his presidency.

The record of the chief-justice, as exhibited in the decisions bearing his name in the Reports, must be pronounced meagre. His true record consists rather in a series of laborious services, from the year 1836 to 1864, in all the causes before the Supreme Court. By whomsoever delivered, the opinions bear somewhat of the impress of Taney's mind and character. He sat in consultation upon them all, and brought to bear upon them the highest order of judicial wisdom. Besides this unprinted record, an extended examination of his leading opinions in the books is essential to a correct estimate of his labors. Our space would not permit any detail of this judicial record. A more limited space would suffice for a note of the leading constitutional questions which he decided. But these pages are hardly the proper place for such a review. To enter upon any argument in support of their soundness would be a matter of supererogation; and to attempt any remarks in opposition to their soundness, would be bold indeed.

Did he possess originality? This is that subtle attribute of genius which the poet, the artist, the orator, the captain, and the statesman are, by some, supposed to inherit from nature, by others to achieve by virtue of a fixed purpose and laborious life. There is certainly such a quality as judicial genius; and originality must constitute one of its leading attributes. Intellectual courage, independence, and honesty must be its leading moral attributes.

It cannot be an overestimate of Marshall to declare that

no man in this country ever possessed judicial genius superior to his, or originality more marked and perfect. Taney must have been inferior to him in this respect, but still eminently entitled to a fair reputation for originality.

There would have been at least a plausible justification for Taney's contenting himself with servilely following the judicial oracles of Marshall. A man lacking in independence, or in original resources, would have yielded to the temptation. But we can discern in no period of his life any traces of servility, or undue yielding to his predecessor. He followed in his system, because, by political opinion, he believed in it—not because it was Marshall's. He might have acquired temporary credit for originality by overturning that system, instead of sustaining it; but it would have been at the expense of his country's interests, and his own permanent reputation. To hold fast to the true and the just, is a higher evidence of originality than is capricious change or hazardous novelty.

It has been previously remarked that the poet is born, and the orator made; and some who had no real appreciation of legal mind, have thought that the lawyer depended upon the faculty of memory, rather than of reason. In truth, all these, the poet, the orator, and the lawyer must be born, not made, if they exist at all. The poet must be born with the faculty of imagination, the orator with the faculty of persuasion, the lawyer with the logical faculty.

The bar of Baltimore aptly, and with careful discrimination, described the mental endowments and moral elevation of the chief-justice, when they resolved:

"To a grasp and comprehensiveness of intellect, which no problem of jurisprudence could embarrass, he united an acuteness and vigor of analysis, and a broad sagacity in the appreciation and application of principles, which rose to the level of genius. Though he had studied his profession until its science was ingrained in his mind, he was attracted to that learning only which illustrates right; and had a wholesome contempt for the subtleties which prevent it."

Jurisprudence, in its best sense, consists of the principles of natural justice and natural freedom applied to the relations of men and the affairs of states. As an artificial system of arbitrary rules and technical dogmas, it is a narrow study; and Burke was beyond cavil no more than just when he pronounced that it narrowed and belittled the understanding. As courts and judges make the law, a magistrate can be very respectable without a particle of original thought

or any brilliancy of intellect. He may draw upon his memory, or trust to the conclusions of the digest. He may administer law for years without advancing it, or even applying a principle, in any correct sense of that term. Precedents are multiplied until it is almost impossible to say what is law, in the conflict of cases. Under such system, he is esteemed the greatest lawyer, who knows the cases most thoroughly. Beyond, and very much elevated above, this mere repository of the opinions of others, is that legal philosopher, who, thoroughly grounded in principles, relies upon the working of a comprehensive understanding, and a quick common sense, for their application to the specific facts of cases as they are presented. This was the judicial distinction of Taney.

In so complicated a system as English and American jurisprudence, there will always be danger that mere legal learning will be estimated beyond its intrinsic value. Still authority has a value, negative as well as an affirmative; a great judge must know what has been decided or written, in order to repudiate and disown, if not to follow and endorse it. Neither Taney nor Marshall was a great legal reader; and yet they were learned men, in the best sense of that term. Judged exclusively by the extent of their libraries, they must be pronounced vastly inferior to such men as Cowen, Story, and Campbell. Their learning consisted in a thorough comprehension and accurate knowledge of legal principles. Their genius consisted in the philosophical application of those principles in judicial administration.

The moral attributes of a chief-justice are of hardly less weight in the estimate of great judicial superiority, than native ability and acquirements. Those essential qualities are independence, honesty, and courage. In the time of Jackson, Taney never exhibited a particle of what can, with any correctness of expression, be denominated servility. And while upon the bench, he was servile neither to the executive power, nor to the slave power, so called. He held the scales of legal and constitutional justice with rigid impartiality.

Did he lend his great office to politics, or at any time give up to party what belonged to his country and mankind? The politician, who can see in the government of his country and the constitution of his fathers, but one interest and but one class, will say, "Yes, he once did; and that, too, at a time when he might have struck a blow that would

have resounded through ages for the liberties of this land." To those who think so, no hasty words of ours will alter that conviction; but time, which brings all things aright, and decides, by a law more reliable than party bias, the motives of men, will sufficiently vindicate Chief-Justice Taney's opinion and conduct in the case of Scott. It was a legal, and not a political, opinion; and as such only it is to be judged. It may have been an erroneous opinion; all we care to insist upon is that it was an honest one.

The fearful events through which we are now passing, are breaking up the great deep, and perhaps upheaving the foundations of the Constitution itself, so far as slavery is concerned. What will be the future opinions of the country as to the legal or constitutional basis on which slavery has hitherto rested, we need not attempt to predict. They may be very different from those now generally received. Or it may appear, as many are now coming to believe, that it never had any legal or constitutional basis at all. Nor are we disposed to interpose any objections to such a conclusion. In any event, this much may be said in defence of Taney's opinion in the case of Dred Scott: that he held —only as did almost everybody else— that slavery had somehow or other a constitutional and legal existence in this country; and that however he may have differed from others, or even from the great majority, as to the particular legal foundation on which slavery stood, it has as yet been found impossible for any one to suggest any other ground that is intrinsically more reasonable or plausible than that given by Taney. Those, therefore, who persist in condemning that opinion, will probably some time find themselves driven to the necessity of adopting, as the only alternative, the idea that slavery has no legal existence at all. It certainly cannot with reason be suspected of Taney, either that he did not know, or was unwilling to put forth, the strongest grounds, in support of his conclusion, that the nature of the case admitted. If that ground be a weak one, so much the better for liberty; but Taney could hardly be expected either to make, or to announce, so revolutionary a discovery as the one we have suggested as the only reasonable alternative to his own opinion.

The grounds on which Taney held that persons of African descent could have no right under the Constitution, were these: that at the time the Constitution was adopted, that race was treated as property, and *that it was the general senti-*

ment of that time "that a black man had no rights which a white man was bound to respect." He does not himself, as so many have erroneously supposed, justify that sentiment; on the contrary he deplores it. But he says that it was, nevertheless, a fact; and he thence concludes that the Constitution must be interpreted in conformity with that fact. He candidly confesses that the same language as that used in the Constitution, would not, if used at this day, authorize any inference against the citizenship of the African race. This confession does honor to his frankness and courage; and the confession itself may one day be worth more than many battles for the rights of an oppressed people. Let it be treasured for what it is, and what it may yet do, rather than condemned for what it is not.

Instead of severely censuring Taney for that opinion, he ought rather to be applauded at least for this: that notwithstanding his ideas as to the right of property in man, he never adopted the Southern theory of state rights, as a means of protecting that property; on the contrary, he held to the ideas of Jay, Marshall, Story, Kent, and Webster, that our national government derived its powers by direct grant of the people themselves, as individuals, and that it was not a simple confederacy of sovereign states, each at liberty to judge for itself when the compact of union was violated, and to withdraw at its pleasure or discretion, or even on its own views of necessity.

His opinion in the *Dred Scott* case implies, too, that slavery can be imposed only upon a single race, those having African blood, and that that race can be enslaved, not because the state governments so choose, but only because, as he thinks, the Constitution itself excepts them from its protection and benefits. But he holds that all other persons are citizens of the United States, and that, as such, they cannot be enslaved by the states. Whether his opinion as to the African race be correct or not, it is, we repeat, to his credit, that he never adopted that absurd theory of states rights, which, if true, would authorize a state to enslave whomsoever it pleased, black or white, without reference to the Constitution of the United States.

Taney's opinion as to the citizenship of the African race, may be erroneous. It is, nevertheless, as a legal opinion, and as a whole, far more logical and consistent, and more favorable to liberty even, than the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Curtis, which was so highly lauded at the North, in

contrast with Taney's; and which was to the effect that it was for each state to determine who might, and who might not, be a citizen of the United States, within her limits, and consequently who might, and who might not, be a slave.

Neither any quasi political conduct of the late chief-justice, nor any political bearings which his judicial opinions may have had, ought ever to have brought any stigma upon his reputation. The time has elapsed when a partisan press should overabuse, or the language of eulogy should overpraise him. He had decided political opinions during the whole of his public life. He was a Federalist in early life; he was a Jackson Democrat afterwards. He was never a states rights Democrat, or a tool of Southern public men.

Chief-Justice Taney's rank, as a judicial statesman, is a topic demanding some consideration. The mutual dependence of law and statesmanship, and the reciprocal relation of the jurist and statesman, in this country, are quite obvious. The political and the judicial statesman require a different order of faculties. Active executive qualities, a nice balance of the practical and the theoretical, a power of adapting himself to men, of judging them and using them, are as essential to the political statesman, as are wisdom in counsel, fertility in resources, comprehension in plans, and originality in projects. To the judicial statesman these are less requisite; and in their place other qualities are indispensable. Independence, honesty, impartiality, freedom from party bias, patriotic purpose, and clear, systematic ideas are essential to the character of the latter.

The relation of the chief-justice of the national court to American statesmanship, is intimate. His business, as causes come before him, is to fix and settle the relations of the states and Federal government, to apply European public law to American institutions, to interpret, test, and try the legislation of Congress, and expound the national charter, so as to guard the rights of the people against congressional and executive encroachments.

Several facts must be remembered in any candid estimate of Chief-Justice Taney as a judicial statesman. Previous to his introduction to this function, he had never held judicial station, or been much in public political life. He had held public offices, but they were legal rather than political. He had been State and Federal Attorney-General, and for a very short time at the head of the fiscal depart-

ment; but he had never been a diplomatist, or a member of either branch of Congress. He also came to the bench after a constitutional system had been adopted and laid out by one of surpassing mental power. Unless a judge were to follow with a new and diametrically opposite system, he could have no opportunity to win laurels to be compared with those already achieved by Marshall.

The constitutional system of Taney was a reflex of that of Marshall. He never, so far as we recollect, differed from that magistrate on any important constitutional question that actually came before him for adjudication. It is well known, however, that before he came to the bench, he differed from Marshall as to the constitutionality of the United States Bank. And we think he would undoubtedly have adhered to his original opinion, had the question ever come before him judicially. It is also well known, that the general opinion of the country on that much vexed question, has heretofore coincided, and probably does still coincide, with that of Taney, rather than with that of Marshall. As that question is one of great practical importance, and one, too, that is likely to come again before that court, we may be excused for expressing our regret that the country cannot have the benefit of Taney's opinion upon it. Such a cause would probably have brought Taney's power of argument into more distinct contrast with that of Marshall, than it has been in any cases actually adjudicated.

As a constructive statesman and an expounder of a new system of government, Taney must be conceded to have been inferior to his great predecessor. But still it may be doubted whether, in his day, there could have been found in the country one more eminently fitted for his post in this respect. It is certain that neither Kent nor Story would have been his equal; and it is doubtful if Webster would have been his superior. Edward Livingston was the only man of his party, who could, in point of qualifications for the place, have competed with him. Marshall, as a constructive statesman and an expounder of a new constitution, has a splendid record of opinions, such as McCulloch and Maryland, Cohens and Virginia, Gibbons and Ogden, Webster and the City of Charleston, and the case of the Cherokee nation. But Taney was afforded no opportunity for such a constitutional record. This circumstance of itself furnishes no certain criterion of his real rank as a judicial statesman. A judge is not responsible for the success of his opinions, nor does he make occa-

sions for the expression of them. It is his proper business to decide accurately and ably what comes before him. We must therefore look beyond this record to determine his real standing as a judicial statesman in the circumstances which surrounded him. Taney has left on record many elaborate, powerfully reasoned, and well written opinions; but he has left few, if any, of what would be designated as shining ones. The entire body of his opinions indicate, what we know to be the fact, that he was clear, sound, and solid, rather than brilliant. How he would have compared with Marshall, had he been called to decide, and write the opinion of the latter, in one of his greatest constitutional questions, may be a matter upon which there would be opposite estimates.

The influence of the chief-justice upon his court was most salutary and useful. It was certainly as great as it can ever be said to be desirable that the influence of one man should be on any bench. It must be said, however, that it was always that safe and healthy influence which springs from superior mind, accredited integrity, and consummate wisdom. His influence upon the jurisprudence of the country will be long felt and appreciated.

The relations of American law to the system of English law and English precedents is a question of vast moment, and the treatment of this relation gives a test by which a chief-justice may fairly be weighed. It is his duty and his privilege to administer American, not English law. He may servilely follow in the ruts of English precedents; or he may rashly throw aside all the wisdom which may have been eliminated by centuries of able men. A wiser course is carefully to select and adapt to our American system what is applicable both in the common law and in the civil system. This Taney cautiously and judiciously did. He admired Coke, Hale, and the ancient sages of the common law; but in questions of American rights he never blindly yielded to their antiquated doctrines. He shunned precedents founded in English monarchical ideas of prerogative and arbitrary power, and wisely tempered the doctrines of governmental rights by those large and more modern doctrines of individual right and natural freedom.

A judge may be an excellent presiding officer, and an elegant, or even profound writer of legal opinions, and yet come short of a first-rate magistrate. To be wise on paper is one thing; to be safe, accurate, and wise in private reflection, and sagacious in the judicial council, is another quite different.

All testimony concurs that it was in the conference that the chief-justice shone with especial lustre. Here was the field of his special services to the country. These are labors which make little display in the Reports, but their extent and value are fully attested by his associates.

The influence of the chief-justice was, in its character, conservative of the past, rather than adventurous for the future. Discreet judicial independence is a quality without which a great chief-justice of the Supreme Court cannot exist. Its absence would cause him to degenerate into a judicial craven. An indiscreet judicial independence would have a tendency to make him a judicial despot, and a radical disorganizer. To the quality of a safe independence, reasonable self-esteem, self-possession, self-will, and self-reliance are essential. At the period in which Taney came to the Chief-Justice's seat, it was of especial moment to the interests of the Republic, that a man equally free from servility and arrogance should occupy that bench. And in Chief-Justice Taney it possessed such a man.

It is manifest that there are two general extremes, each alike unfortunate, if not detrimental to public interests, to which such a court of last appeal may have inclined at an effort like his. It might be radically bent on setting aside all that had been done by the same, and by other courts, and hold null all that Congress might do; or, on the other hand, it might pusillanimously bow to the judgments of his predecessors, and pliantly confirm whatever party politics enacted. It may be regarded as a noticeable fact, that in the last sixty years the Supreme Court has never declared more than one law of Congress unconstitutional. This may have been the result of one or another cause. It is no more than justice to Taney to declare that, in Marshall's time, more questionable legislation passed unchallenged by his court, than in Taney's day; and no one has ever intimated that Marshall lacked independence.

The excellence of the chief-justice, as a presiding officer in the Supreme Court, was of a peculiar quality. It did not depend upon majestic mien, or portly frame, or artificial grace, or even what is popularly known as judicial dignity. The chief was not a Denman or a Mansfield in personal appearance. He was a plain, feeble, unpretentious old man; but by his love of justice, his devotion to truth, his quiet respectful mien, he accomplished what others obtained through more showy qualities. The affable and winning na-

ture of the man, the calm, equable temper, the uniform impartiality, the docility and equanimity of his manner to all who appeared before him, are amply attested. These are qualities as rare as they are valuable.

With Chief-Justice Marshall the contrast is more direct from his succession to the same office. It has even been claimed that the similarity of mental constitution was so striking as to have been a marvel. This has not seemed to us entirely justified; they were both patient listeners, calm reasoners, and strong comprehensive thinkers. There was both similarity and dissimilarity; the written style of Marshall was hard, although his periods were well rounded. Taney's was more easy and flowing, yet not rotund. Marshall never employed a superfluous word; Taney was less laboriously concise and precise. But we very much question whether either ever gave much care to mere style, beyond perspicuity, directness, and terseness; yet style comes from nature, rather than from art, and every man of a decided tone of mind, much given to placing his thoughts upon paper, will come eventually to have a style of his own; this was certainly true of Marshall and Taney.

In mental power and natural capacity they were both of the first order. In quickness, Marshall must have been the superior; in keenness, perhaps, also; but in comprehension it would be hard to make the one the superior of the other. The principal means of determining comparative merits in such respects would be a life-long intimacy, and familiar personal and official relations. With regard to Marshall, few, if any, survive, who have had such advantages; with Taney, more. We have it from one of his associates, that his calmness and quietness in listening to arguments gave little or no indication as to how quick or slow he was in appreciating a point; and when it came to the conference, and an apparently new view was thrown out, so clear, comprehensive, and exhaustive had been his reflection on the cause, that it was quite impossible to determine whether the view was in reality new to him or not.

In point of reading, there was probably not so much difference between the two. It is related that the law library of Marshall consisted only of about three hundred volumes, and that of Taney is reported to have been somewhat, but not much, more extensive. Neither owed much of his usefulness or his eminence to books; each had a thorough appreciation and mastery of those principles which are the foun-

tains of natural justice, and which afforded him a fund for his aid beyond all that libraries could furnish.

In speaking of acquirements, it would be unjust to claim a very high rank for either Marshall or Taney. In mere legal reading, Story was more than the equal of both; but in judicial ability and wisdom he was not to be named with either. In the case of Taney it has sometimes been said, that his physical infirmities did not permit him to enter upon those long investigations of mere authority, which he would have otherwise undertaken. This may have been a cause, but we are satisfied it was not the main cause. The real cause was a perfectly accurate appreciation of the true value of what passes for authority in the science of jurisprudence. He was well grounded in the principles of the science, and beyond those principles he had little regard for authority, either as embodied in cases, or in elementary treatises. He was often heard to declare that he cared little for the cases which make such huge masses of law precedents. This had its advantages and its disadvantages, but the former more than counterbalanced the latter. The question whether he lacked any essential learning for his station, is one that is easily answered; and, so far as we have heard any answer, it has been uniform, that his reading was abundant for his needs.

He had some but not many drawbacks upon the standard of the highest public character. His opinions are clear, concise, and well written; but they do not indicate the elegant polish of a scholar, or the ripe culture of a man of letters. These he neither aspired to nor coveted. They were not essential to his place, and he was too busy a man to sacrifice to judicial graces, if he had had the inclination. He never was a law reformer, and, so far as we know, never said a word in favor of that so much needed work. But he certainly was never a bigoted old fogy in the law; and it must be remembered that he was called to fill a place which required him to administer and expound the law as he found it rather than to remodel or reform it. It is also no more than guarded justice to assume, as a fair inference from the liberality of some of his opinions, and the progressive tendencies of some of the views he expressed from the bench, that, had others more especially charged with such a work initiated a thorough and searching reform of the entire judicial system of the United States, they would have found in the chief-justice no unfriendly opposition. He

would have demanded, as the only condition, that the reform should be real, and the progress reconstructive and not merely destructive. If he is not entitled to the epithet of a law reformer, he certainly is entitled to be pronounced a liberal man.

Some have gone so far in depreciation of him as to consider him only as a man of quite moderate capacity and more moderate learning advanced to a high place, and, by long continuance in its routine, become accustomed to its studies and practice, and therefore enabled respectably to fulfil its duties, but never exhibiting legal genius like Marshall, or learning like Story, or industry like Shaw. This is certainly a criticism so devoid of plausible fairness as to indicate no real appreciation of the man, or acquaintance with his labors. Others, whose politics tinge all their opinions, derided him, while he lived, as the enemy of the Union, the friend of slavery, and the sympathizer with rebellion, and gladly welcomed his death as a public blessing. Such opinions are not entitled to the respect we give to candid judgments by answering them. In his constitutional opinions he was to the fullest extent committed against any right of secession or nullification, and was, through life, a staunch friend of the Union and the Constitution. The only time in which he came in contact with the executive government during the rebellion was in his opinion in the case of Merryman, which he could neither avoid nor hesitate in. It was a case of *habeas corpus*, involving the question of the lawfulness of its suspension by the executive. He decided against such a right, and ordered the writ to issue; but on the military authority refusing to obey it, he calmly delivered his judgment that such a proceeding was illegal, but inasmuch as the civil power was without authority to enforce law against military rule, he ordered a copy of his opinion to be filed on the records of the court, to the end that the law might be known if not respected. Less he could not have done consistently with self-respect; more he could not do consistently with the necessary subordination, in time of war, of the judicial to the military power.

In many respects, and in some particulars, the life of Chief-Justice Taney was supremely fortunate. He was destitute of brilliant parts, yet he early succeeded in public and professional life, not beyond his deserts, but earlier and more persistently than can always be relied upon by the most meritorious. It is not enough that a man possesses

ability and character to ensure success in life. A certain amount of energy, enterprise, and aid from others is quite as essential. In Andrew Jackson, Mr. Taney found a man quick to appreciate ability, however unpromising the exterior, and true to reward those who served him. Taney was of great use to Jackson in the two offices he held in the Cabinet; and Jackson, in turn, furnished Taney the situation for which nature exactly fitted him.

Mr. Taney was never wealthy, although his practice must have been as lucrative as that of any one at the Maryland bar, excepting, perhaps, Pinkney and Martin; and they amassed no fortunes. But Pinkney was extravagant, and engaged much in the expensive luxury of diplomatic service; Martin was of dissolute habits. Neither was a good business man in regard to money. Taney was neither of expensive tastes nor dissolute habits, and was by no means a bad manager in money matters; and was actively engaged at the bar up to the age of fifty-nine. We must therefore look for the cause of his lack of property in the small revenues which the most successful practice in Maryland in those days afforded. It is said that according to his means he was very charitable.

The entire life of the chief-justice, in late years, must have been an agreeable one. It was easy, honorable, and useful. He was a man of regular habits, abstemious life, and domestic character. He was a careful, though not an extensive, reader of solid literature. In early life he had mastered the standard elementary law works; but paid little attention to the numberless brood that compose modern elementary treatises. He had Coke, Littleton, Coke's Reports, Comyn's Digest, and such ancient fountains of the common law, by heart. This was the result of his early studies and his early contests at the bar. He possessed nothing of the restless uneasiness of unsatisfied ambition; nor was he compelled to submit to the embarrassments and distractions of conflicting and inharmonious pursuits. He loved the law, and was devoted with singleness of purpose to its studies and its thoughts. Neither elegant letters nor distracting politics kept his mind divided. He possessed that true ambition which is content to merit renown, without much solicitude as to seeing it. He found his relaxation in the charms of domestic life, and agreeable, but never ambitious conversation. His recreation he found—not like some great lawyers, in poetry, or like others, in mathematics, or others, in literary dissipation—but

in the philosophy of the law itself. When in legal practice, he had no aspiration for oratory to sustain or to lose; when upon the bench, he had no vain pride to appear anything greater than he really was. This answer of life to the demands of the man's nature, brought that happy contentment and equanimity which are a fortune to its possessor.

The life of the chief-justice in term time must have been highly agreeable. Having but few books, he relied upon reflection and the Law Library for his law. His day's work may be briefly described. He was a reasonably early riser. At eleven, he and his associates proceeded to the court-room. Listening to arguments until the adjournment, he then went to his library, still carrying in his mind the causes to which he had listened during the session. While his memory was fresh, he would turn to such few books as he found it desirable to refer to. This was a quick and easy work. That accomplished, he would lie down for an hour's sleep. This over, he returned to his labors. It was then, when he came to digest the case, and to bring to bear upon it his capacious reflective powers, that the genius of the chief-justice shone with its highest lustre. He brought to bear upon the logic of the enquiry the vast powers of his understanding. There was no dallying with the unessential and the trifling detail; but he went directly to the main point, brushing away with a sturdy independence all besides. There was no trial of the issue by the decisions of others, or the borrowed reasoning of others. For cases he habitually cared but little, and in these supreme hours devoted to reflection, he totally eschewed them. There was no approach to a part, but a comprehensive appreciation of the whole. When this process was completed, an opinion was formed, which added something to the stock of human knowledge. The subsequent labor of committing the reasoning to paper was a quick work.

The chief-justice had few, if any, of the foibles, peculiarities, or eccentricities of old age, beyond his habit of inveterate smoking. His immaculate private character and unsullied private life are unquestioned in any quarter. The bitterest tongue of party malignity never presumed to hint a stain upon the private fame of Taney. His friendships were firm, and his affections strong. The symmetry, simplicity, directness, and intensity of his nature were the topics of familiar commendation. His faculty of fixing friends was a trait not so much spoken of, but known to his familiar com-

panions. He had few, if any, enemies. He had nothing of the pride of station; but much of the generosity of greatness, much real kindness of heart.

The death of the chief-justice coming so closely upon the departure of other great judges of this country and England, a comparison with some of them is provoked; but we have no space for details. In our country, McLean, Domiell, Bronson, Gibson, and Shaw have recently passed away. In England, Denman, Parke, Campbell, Truro, and Lyndhurst have lately gone from the scenes of court to higher scenes than any courts have witnessed. If we contrast any of them, where shall we seek the superior of Taney? Nay, more: if we array beside him the long list of the illustrious dead, where, beyond a Mansfield, a Lyndhurst, or a Marshall, shall we find an equal? The most distinguished of recent state judges have been Shaw, Gibson, and Bronson; of these the latter was incomparably the greatest man, although the rank of both the others has been conclusively established first-class magistrates.

Some points of resemblance, and some marks of dissimilarity between Marshall and Taney we have already indicated. We incline to the opinion that, taking the nature of the men, and the character of the services rendered by them respectively, it must be the judgment of impartial posterity that Marshall was the greater man. But we much question whether that must be conceded in comparing the late chief-justice with either Mansfield or Lyndhurst. Both were more accomplished men, and riper scholars in the mere learning of the law; but neither could have been his superior as a great magistrate. Both Lyndhurst and Mansfield were active politicians while they were judges. Both were orators and literary men. But these things add little in the estimate of a great chief-justice. The pure fame of Marshall and Taney will endure as long as any record remains of American institutions.

Art. IV.—1. *Fama Posthuma a la vida y muerte del doctor Frey Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* Por Montalvan. Madrid, 1817.

2. *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova.* Por Nicolas Antonio. Madrid, 1784.

3. *Notice sur Lope de Vega in tète de sa traduction.* Par M. La Beaumelle. Paris, 1862.

4. *Some account of the Life and Writings of Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* By HENRY RICHARD LORD HOLLAND. London, 1860.

5. *Planto funebre en la muerte de Lope Felix de Vega-Carpio.* Por LARRAMENDI. Madrid, 1635.

6. *History of Spanish Literature* By GEORGE TICKNOR. In three vols.; third American edition, corrected and enlarged. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1863.

THE intellectual decay of nations is one of the most interesting subjects that can engage the attention of the psychologist, the philosopher, or the statesman; and nowhere has it been more strikingly exemplified in modern times than in Spain. We do not make this remark in any offensive spirit, or with any disposition to disparage one of the noblest races that have shed lustre on Europe by their enterprising spirit, their intellectual vigor and activity, and their chivalric bravery. No intelligent Spaniard denies that the national intellect is not what it once was. Nor is there any sufficient reason why he should. As well might he deny that his own physical powers have failed at the age of sixty, when it is evident to all who know him that he can no longer perform the feats by which he was distinguished in early life. If he has been temperate in his habits, he is in no manner responsible for the loss of his strength, since he has become weak only in accordance with the same law of nature which ordains that the oak of the forest, though it flourish for ages, will yet one day encumber, as a blighted trunk, the earth, which its friendly branches have so long sheltered. If Spain were the only nation that has exhibited evidences of decay in a similar manner, her people would have some reason to feel sensitive on the subject; but they can point to the greatest nations of all antiquity as examples of the operation of the same law. For this purpose Greece and Rome would be sufficient.

Nor need they search long for modern examples; they need only turn to Italy, which is no more than the shadow, in intellectual vigor and activity, of what she once was. Indeed, Italy has fallen lower in this respect than Spain; but the former has been much longer oppressed by the stranger than the latter. From the time of Ferdinand and Isabella to the present, Spain has had to groan but for a very brief period under any foreign yoke, whereas during the same period Italy has not enjoyed entire freedom from foreign oppression for a single

year, and does not at the present moment. Had it been otherwise we should have wondered much more at the decay of Italy than at that of Spain, because great as Lope de Vega, Calderon, and Quevedo, undoubtedly were as thinkers, it must be admitted that they were inferior to Dante, Tasso, Ariosto, and Boccaccio. It may be said that neither Italy nor any other country has produced a writer superior to Cervantes in the same field. In the department of prose fiction, or romance, the author of Don Quixote is not only without a rival, but absolutely inimitable; he occupies a position among novelists quite as high as that occupied by Homer among poets; still, as we have said, the former intellect of Italy surpassed that of Spain; but it was the only national intellect that did surpass it at the time.

Since the decline of both literature and science in Spain cannot, as we have seen, be attributed to foreign domination, its cause must be sought elsewhere; although it is not our purpose, just now, to make any such search. What we have proposed to ourselves is simply to give a cursory glance at the writings of Lope de Vega, making such observations as may occur to us in passing on his principal works, and on the peculiarities of his genius, alluding here and there to the character of the man, as we find it developed in his productions. But who can devote his attention to any Spanish author of the sixteenth century without contrasting that period with the present? Then the Spanish mind was all activity and vigor; now it is not only inactive, but dormant. A sort of lethargy broods upon it like that of old age. To what law is this to be attributed? What is its cause? Who can solve the problem?

We know that many have attempted its solution, and that, if we are to accept their own word, all have entirely succeeded, although each has decided much more in accordance with his own prejudices than the evidences afforded by history or ethnology. The commonest solution at the present day is to say that the Roman Catholic religion has so fettered the national intellect as to stunt and enfeeble it. Those who decide the question thus summarily and easily, think that when they have compared Spain with the Protestant countries of Germany, England, and America, any further proof would be superfluous. It is not our business or design to oppose or vindicate any sect whatever; but to discover truth when we can, and present it to those who are capable of appreciating it. Accordingly, we will give the argument just referred to, if

such it may be called, all the consideration which the most zealous of its authors can claim for it. But we would have them remember that comparisons of this kind must be general, in order to admit that any important conclusions be drawn from them. It is not sufficient to compare Spain with Germany, England, and America: it should also be compared with Denmark, Sweden, and Holland. If this were carefully and intelligently done, it would afford no evidence that religion has anything to do with the phenomenon under consideration. Still less evidence would be afforded were Spain compared with France, Belgium, and Austria. What Protestant countries exhibit more intellectual activity, or more intellectual vigor, than these?

Now, if Catholicism does not stunt the French, Belgian, or Austrian intellect, by what process of logic can it be said to stunt the Spanish intellect? But what was the religion of Spain in the golden age of its literature? Were not the Spaniards Catholics then as well as now? Its greatest writers were not only Catholics, but ecclesiastics. This is true both of Lope de Vega and Calderon; and if Cervantes was not an ecclesiastic, he was at least a monk. Nay, the most renowned Spanish authors were familiars of the Inquisition. If we make another comparison or two, we shall see still more plainly how absurd it is to make the intellectual vigor or activity of a people depend on their theological opinions. It can hardly be pretended that either the Greeks or Romans were Protestants; but what Protestant nations have produced more sublime geniuses? At no time were the Greeks more superstitious than when Homer wrote; the poet himself was not altogether free from that feeling; but that did not prevent him from surpassing all others, including our Protestant and Puritanical Milton, undoubtedly great and sublime as the author of "Paradise Lost" is.

Passing over the divine Dante, and the scarcely less divine Tasso, Angelo, and Raphael, &c., all of whom were devout Catholics, we would ask, Why did not Catholicism stunt the intellects of Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon, if it has been the cause of stunting the national intellect of Spain? The very same logicians who make Catholicism responsible for the decay of Spanish intellect, regard the founders of our religion as the greatest thinkers the modern world has produced, forgetting that all had been educated by priests and monks. Was not Luther himself a monk? had any Protestant teach-

er ever taught him a lesson? and was he anything the less vigorous in his intellect, or the less powerful in his logic on this account? Let us hear no more, then, of the silliness and fanaticism of pretending to account for the operation of a natural law which we do not understand, by seeking to cast odium on the religion of the large majority of the Christian world. Such a course is nothing less foolish than that of the ignorant Pagans of the olden times, who used to regard an eclipse of the sun or moon, or even the appearance of a comet, as a mark of the divine displeasure, and consequently as a harbinger of some frightful calamity.

If any human agency can be said to have hastened the decay of Spanish intellect, it was the banishment of the Moors; and politics, or rather ethnological hatred, had much more to do with this than religion. In other words, the Spaniards hated the Moors much more for the oppression they had suffered from them for centuries, than for their faith in Mahomet or the Koran. Indeed, this latter was but a secondary cause, if a cause at all. Nor is the fact denied by the Arabic historians, nearly all of whom bear testimony to the constant efforts of the Catholic priests and monks to save the Moors from popular violence.

That the Moors were a highly intellectual people cannot be denied.* They have left evidences of the fact in a thousand forms, not only to Spain, but to all Europe. No conquerors ever improved the subject race, both physically and mentally, more than they did the people of Spain; for they freely intermarried with all ranks. The poetical literature of Spain is particularly indebted to the Moors—especially the poetry of love and chivalry, which is decidedly Arabic in its most beautiful and fascinating characteristics. Is it easy to understand that a people who brought so much intelligence and thought into Spain, and that exercised so powerful an intellectual influence throughout Europe for nearly three centuries, could not be expelled or exterminated, without serious loss to those with whom their best blood had mingled so freely? Alvarez, Martinez, and other historians tell us that there was Moorish blood in the veins both of Lope de Vega and Cervantes; and it must be admitted that they assign very plausible if not convincing reasons for believing the fact. Be this as it may, the decline

*See articles entitled "The Saracenic Civilization in Spain," and "The Poetical Literature of Spain," in numbers iv. and vi., respectively, of this journal.

of Spanish literature commenced very soon after the expulsion of the Moors; its golden age had not yet passed at the time they were expelled. Thus Cervantes was born in 1549 and died in 1616; Lope de Vega was born in 1562 and died in 1635; Ercilla was born in 1533 and died in 1600; Quevedo was born in 1570 and died in 1645; and Calderon was born in 1601 and died in 1667.

These are the writers of the golden age, and they were all contemporaries; all were born before the expulsion of the Moors, which took place in 1609; and there have been no writers since their time that have enjoyed European fame—not one equal to the least meritorious or least famous of them. Similar remarks will apply with equal force to the scientific men of Spain and those skilled in the mechanic arts. Prior to the expulsion no country could boast of more skilful mechanics, or of more learned scholars. There was such a superfluity of the latter that they used to migrate in large numbers to Italy, France, Germany, and England, to engage in the profession of teaching. Even as early as the time of Dante they used to teach the Italians the language of their ancestors, and not only as private tutors competing with the natives, but as professors in their best colleges and universities.

When the final expulsion took place large numbers of those who had contributed most by their intelligence, industry, and skill, to the material prosperity as well as to the intellectual activity of Spain, settled in almost every country in Europe, but nowhere more than in Catholic France, which affords still further evidence that it was the people themselves more than their religion that had excited the hatred of the Spaniards. Whether Lope de Vega had Moorish blood in him or not, certain it is that the wonderful fecundity of his genius was much more characteristic of the Asiatic than of the European mind. Nor is this the only resemblance which his productions bore to those of the principal writers of Arabia, as we could show even in this brief paper, did we not think it more satisfactory, if not more interesting to the reader, to confine ourselves, on the present occasion, to the consideration of his writings as such, and of the relation which they bear to his education and character.

We have already seen that he was born about the middle of the sixteenth century, his birth-place being Madrid, whither his parents had come a short time previously from De Vega in the picturesque valley of Corriedo. All his biographers

tell us that he displayed extraordinary faculties even in his infancy. Montalvan informs us that he read Latin as well as Spanish when only five years old, and that as he did not yet know how to write, he dictated verses to his comrades, who liked them so well that they purchased them from him with pieces of sweet cake and such other dainties as children get from their nurses. Doubtless this is an exaggeration; but that he was able to write very agreeable verses at the age of ten is beyond question.

It does not appear that his father had any patrimony; for we find that having died when Lope was quite young, the family became so much impoverished as to be obliged to separate. Fortunately for the future author, he was taken in hands by his uncle, Don Miguel de Carpio, who took every pains to have him thoroughly educated. He was no more than twelve years old when he sent him to the Imperial College at Madrid; nor did any student of that famous institution avail himself more eagerly of the advantages it offered than young Lope. Being somewhat eccentric, however, he soon grew tired of the monotony of a college, and resolved to take a tour through the country in search of adventures, in company with a companion; but intended to return to his studies as soon as he had gratified himself in this respect. After travelling a considerable distance, without any very definite object, the two truants thought it best to return home. With this view, they went into a broker's office to change a few doubloons and get what ready money they could for a gold chain belonging to Lope, but he had them arrested as robbers. The magistrate before whom they were brought was satisfied on examination that they were not dishonest but foolish, and accordingly sent a constable with them to Madrid to deliver them up to their friends.

It would seem that Lope was not forgiven by his uncle for running away from college as he did; for, although only a little over fourteen years old, he entered the army and served against the Portuguese at Terceira, in 1577. It is not known how long he remained in the army, probably not more than a year, for at the beginning of 1579, we find him attached to the Bishop of Avilla, who, seeing that he possessed undoubted genius, had the generosity to send him to the University of Alcala to finish his education. In a short time he got the degree of bachelor, and was about to be ordained as a priest, when it was found that he had fallen in love, in the most literal sense of that term. This got him into

disgrace both with the bishop and the faculty of the college, and he set out once more in search of adventures.

He wrote a sort of dramatic romance at this time, entitled *Dorothea*, in which he figures himself under the name of *Fernando*. Montalvan would have the world believe that most of the scenes in which he appears himself are fictitious; but even he does not deny that there is a good deal in the piece which may be regarded as a faithful representation of what the young poet's life really was at that time. In speaking of this piece, Mr. Ticknor observes that the scene between the hero and Dorothea, in the first act, the account of his weeping behind the door with Marfisa on the day she was to be married to another, and most of the narrative parts in the fourth act have an air of reality about them that hardly permits us to doubt they were true. Taken together, however, they did him little credit as a young man of honor and a cavalier. In a note to the same passage, we are referred to the first act and sixth scene, in which Fernando (Lope), "having coolly made up his mind to abandon Marfisa, goes to her and pretends he has killed one man, and wounded another, in a street brawl, obtaining by this base falsehood the unhappy creature's jewels, which he needed to pay his expenses, and which she gave him out of her overflowing affection."*

After wandering about for some months, he came to Madrid, where he was kindly received by the young Duke of Alva, grandson of the celebrated favorite of Phillip II., but confounded with that personage by many of his biographers. At the suggestion of the duke, who wished to figure in a book, in the disguise of a shepherd, he wrote his *Arcadia*, a pastoral romance, interspersed with verses, on the plan of the *Diana* of Montemayor and the *Galatea* of Cervantes. Never was mortal praised more highly than is the author's patron, or rather the grandfather of his patron, in this pastoral. The principal panegyric is put in the mouth of the magician, Dardanio, one of the personages in the *Arcadia*. The magician is exhibiting certain statues in his cavern, and describing prophetically what they represent. His language shows that even at this early period of his literary career, the author had made himself well acquainted with the best Greek and Roman models. "This last," says Dardanio, "whose grey head is adorned by

* History of Spanish Lit., vol. ii., p. 155.

the ever verdant leaves of the ungrateful Daphne, merited by so many victories, is the immortal soldier, Don Fernando de Toledo Duke of Alva, so justly worthy of that fame which you behold lifting herself to heaven from the plumes of the helmet, with the trump of gold, through which she will forever proclaim his exploits, and spread his name from Spanish Tagus to the African Mutazend, and from the Neapolitan Sabeto to the French Garonne. This will be Pompilius in religion, Radamanthus in serenity, Belisarius in his guerdon, Anaxagoras in his constancy, Epaminondas in magnanimity, Themistocles in his love of country, Piriander in wedlock, Pomponius in veracity, Alexander Severus in justice, Attilius (Regulus) in fidelity, Cato in modesty, and finally, Timotheus in the felicity which attended all his wars."

Exaggerated as this praise is, we have no reason to believe that the author did not believe it to be substantially true. Be this as it may, it is certain that he was much attached to the young duke, who, besides being his best friend, had the additional recommendation to him of having a taste for literature.* The people of Holland speak of the Duke of Alva to this day as a monster worthy only of everlasting infamy. Nor does he bear any better character either in English or German history. Southey speaks of him as "one whose stern and inexorable nature made him capable of cruelties to which he was instigated by a mistaken sense of duty." He does not forget to add, however, that in his own country (Spain) "he is remembered only for his great qualities, his signal services, and his redeeming virtues." This shows that after all Lope did no violence to the truth of history, since no author is obliged to be guided by the historians of other countries in estimating the character of his fellow-countrymen, especially when those historians are evidently hostile towards him. It was natural enough that Lope should entertain a high opinion of one whose generous patronage enabled him to marry a lady of high rank whom he tenderly loved. He had been married, however, but a short time to Dona Isabel Diaz, when his happiness was rudely interrupted. It seems that as early as the time of De Vega there were critics in Spain who possessed both the ability and the manliness to expose bad taste. Our author was

* Mr. Ticknor tells us that if he does not mistake, there is a *Cancion* of the duke's in the Cancionero General of 1575, History of Sp. Lit., vol. ii., p. 156.

so severely criticised that he felt bound to avenge himself by writing an elaborate satire in verse on the critic. The latter in turn resolved to have revenge; he challenged the satirist, who was as skilful with the sword as he was with the pen, and the result was that the critic was severely if not mortally wounded, so that Lope had to leave Madrid once more.

His place of exile was Valencia, which in a literary point of view ranked next to the capital. Here he had to remain for three years separated from his wife; on his return to Madrid she welcomed him with every mark of affection, a feeling fully reciprocated by him; but she died in a few months, leaving him sincerely disconsolate at least for a month or two; although some of his biographers tell us that during most of the time of his absence he was corresponding with another lady; and that his grief was caused not so much by the death of his wife as by the rejection of his suit by his new mistress.* In the absence of any other evidence, the eclogue, in which his wife's death was lamented, would seem to exculpate him from any such charge, especially as he was so anxious to have it well done that he employed another poet, who was also a personal friend, to assist him. Thus Lope laments as the widowed husband, speaking throughout of his own character, but under an assumed name, Pedro de Medina Medinilla, speaking in terms equally tender and passionate as a sympathizing friend. It is almost needless to add that this is a singular production; but it does not possess the less merit on this account. The two different styles are easily detected by the decided superiority of that of Lope, who is nowhere more felicitous in the expression of strong and natural passion than in several passages of this strange performance.

But before proceeding any further with our remarks on the incidents of the poet's life, we think it best, if only to justify our impressions, to give a few specimens of his principal productions. These will serve to relieve the tedium of a sketch which must necessarily be dry; in other words, they will encourage the reader to accompany us in our examination, by enabling him to form an opinion of his own as he proceeds of the first work of importance that emanated from De Vega, although it may also be said to

* "Moins d'un an après son retour," says M. E. Regnard, "il perdit sa femme. Ce malheur, ou plutot le chagrin d'avoir vu ses vœux rejétés par une autre dame qu'il a célébrée sous le nom de Filis, enfin le besoin de distraction le ramenérent au service."

contain more faults than any other—the *Arcadia*, already alluded to. The plot is artificial; the fable is improbable, much too long, and possesses but little interest The manners of the principal characters could scarcely be said to be those of any class at any age; much less could they be true or natural as applied to shepherds and shepherdesses. But after due allowance has been made for these defects, no one can fail to admire its graphic and picturesque descriptions and sparkling dialogues, everywhere interspersed as they are with veritable lyrical gems. Nothing could be more meagre than the fable. We need therefore occupy but little space in explaining it.

Anfriso, a young shepherd, of such noble extraction and soaring ambition that he regards Jupiter as his grandfather, loves Belisarda and is beloved by her in return; but the parents of the lady oppose the match, because they prefer to have her married to Salcio, who was "as rich as he was ignorant, as presumptuous as he was rich, as bold as he was unpolished, and as fortunate as he was unworthy." But the rich man had more friends than his poor rival. Accordingly, Anfriso's parents were earnestly advised to send him with his flocks to a distant pasture; nor did they fail to comply with suggestions which seemed so much for their good. But it so happened that the lady's father had occasion to go to the same place, taking his daughter with him. This afforded the lovers an opportunity of meeting once more; but scandalous tongues were soon so busy with the subject that Belisarda had to request him to absent himself for awhile. He complies as a matter of course, discards the habit of the shepherd for the present, and sets out for Italy. Here he betakes himself to the mountains, where he loses his way at night, and in seeking to regain it happens to enter the cavern of the magician, Dardanio, the personage to whom we have already alluded, and who received him not as a stranger, but as an old friend, telling him that he was ready to gratify him in anything he wished for, however impossible it might seem to ordinary mortals. He might have wished to have Belisarda at once for his wife; but that might have spoiled the story. Accordingly, he is content for the present with merely wishing to see her.

The magician made no delay, but immediately raised a spirit, who took them up in a whirlwind to a point where they had a bird's eye view of Europe, Asia, and Africa,

and then set them down together on Mount Cyllene. The magician is now obliged to travel without his friend the spirit, who, however, delegates to him sufficient of his power for all necessary purposes. The course he adopts is to metamorphose himself into a mule and take Anfriso on his back in the form of an old woodman. In this disguise they approach Belisarda, whom they find driving a flock of ducks. As she is frequently found at this work instead of attending sheep, the poet has been censured by many critics for his want of fidelity to nature and custom. There is no doubt that he often errs glaringly in these respects; but he is guilty of no error in the present instance, for all who know anything of pastoral life, especially in the middle of the sixteenth century, are aware that there was scarcely any shepherdess—nor is there at the present day—without a flock of ducks or geese. But the worst of it was that Belisarda was not alone with the ducks. The magician and Anfriso came near enough to see her in conversation with Olympio, one of her numerous admirers. They are not near enough to hear all that passes, but they learn that the shepherd is not sanguine enough to hope to win her affections. His only request is that she will give him a black riband in exchange for a carved spoon. In an evil hour she consents. Anfriso would have her put to death instantly for this, having no doubt of her perfidy; but instead of granting his wish, the magician carries him back to the Apennines in a whirlwind as fast as they came, and then disappears, leaving him to shift for himself as best he can, without making any attempt to explain the conduct of Belisarda, or to relieve his mind from the jealousy which it occasioned.

On reaching the sea shore after many wanderings, he meets with a friend who has letters for him from his parents. He returns home with all possible speed, and his first care is to pay court to Anarda, in order to be avenged of Belisarda, by making her jealous. The lady, conscious of not having deserved this, imitates her lover's example, and affects to favor Olympio in his presence. Both are quite successful in their attempts, and consequently as miserable as they can be. Belisarda is rendered so desperate in a few days by her jealousy that she marries Salcio. She meets Anfriso soon after, an explanation takes place, but it is too late. Anfriso had already applied for relief to the sage Polinesta, famous for curing the most desperate cases of love, who tells him that he must strip himself of whatever he had worn till that time,

put on fresh garments, bathe in various waters, and rid himself with various perfumes of the odor of his old imaginations. All this being done, he must visit the temple of the liberal arts, where alone a complete and permanent cure can be effected. With this view, Lady Grammar receives him into her saloon, and reads him a poem on the art over which she presides. Rhetoric, Logic, Geometry, Arithmetic, &c., do the same. Astrology entertains him with a sonnet, Music with a song to her viol, and Poetry sings her own praises to the harp. Nor is all this sufficient; in order that there be no danger of relapse, her patient must mount the great hill and arrive at the Temple of *Desengamo*, a goddess nowhere known out of Spain, but whose attributes are nearly identical with those of the Athenian Minerva.

We have thus given the network in full, though as briefly as possible, not because it is particularly interesting in itself, but because it gives a better general idea of the plots of the author than any other piece he has written. It may well seem difficult, indeed, to expect much that is agreeable or meritorious from so incongruous a mixture. This was our impression on reading the argument prefixed to the *Arcadia;* but it was very soon removed by the perusal of the poem itself. In short, we think that none can read it with any degree of care without agreeing with Southey, that "although the meagreness of its fable might make it appear insipid and tedious to a hasty, an idle, or a presumptuous critic, he who should be in a state of mind *and knowledge* to appreciate it fairly, let him open the volume where he might, would feel himself engaged with no ordinary writer, and would not readily lay it down from weariness."

What is most difficult, if not impossible, is to find in a work of so much variety a passage that can be regarded as a fair specimen of its character as a whole—a difficulty which is greatly increased in a translation; for it too often happens that it is the best passages that are worst rendered, and *vice versa*. This is particularly true of the *Arcadia*, in which those effusions which have been the delight of Spaniards for nearly three centuries are utterly untranslatable. For this reason we will choose a passage which is remarkable more for its train of thought than for the merit of the poetry. The following verses are put into the mouth of one who in youth had loved not "wisely but too well:"

I.

"In the green season of my flowering years,
I liv'd, O Love! a captive in thy chains!
Sung of deluded hopes and idle fears,
And wept thy follies in my wisest strains:
Sad sport of time when under thy control,
So wild was grown my wit, so blind my soul.

II.

"But from the yoke which once my courage tam'd,
I, undeceived, at length have slipp'd my head,
And in that sun, whose rays my soul enflam'd,
What scraps I rescued at my ease I spread.
So shall I altars to *Indifference* raise,
And chant without alarm returning freedom's praise.

III.

"So on their chains the ransom'd captives dwell;
So carols one who, cured, relates his wound;
So slaves of masters, troops of battle tell,
As I my cheerful liberty resound.
Freed, sea and burning fire, from thy control,
Prison, wound, war, and tyrant of my soul.

IV.

"Remain, then, faithless friend, thy arts to try
On such as court alternate joy and pain;
For me, I dare her very eyes defy,
I scorn the amorous snare, the pleasing chain,
That held enthrall'd my cheated heart so long,
And charm'd my erring soul, unconscious of its wrong."

Whether it was the hardness of Phillis's heart or the death of his wife that affected him most, certain it is that he assured all his friends that he could find no consolation either at Madrid or Valencia. Just then Phillip II. was preparing the famous expedition (Armada) which was to have overthrown the power of Elizabeth, and made England an appendage to the Spanish crown. He tells us himself, that some six months after the death of his wife, finding that his mistress refused to smile upon him, he shouldered his musket, and, followed by his friend Condé, the faithful companion of his exile at Valencia, embarked at Lisbon on the Armada, where he used the verses he had written to Phillis as wadding for his fusee.*

Some of his biographers think that he was not so ungallant as he represents himself, and there seems to be some foundation for that opinion, for what he says most positively on the subject in one sonnet or ode, he as positively contradicts in another. Thus, for example, in writing to Belisa (his wife) he says, "Let Heaven condemn me to eternal woe, if I

* "Volando en lacos del canon violento,
Los papeles de Filis por el viento."

do not detest Phillis and adore thee." In several ballads to Phillis, written about the same time, he calls her his "only love," "the only one of thy sex that has charge of my heart." In three of these ballads the endearing words, "*Amada pastora mia*," occur in every stanza.

The fate of the Armada is too well known to render it necessary that we should say anything on the subject in this paper; suffice it to remark that the poet barely escaped with his life. Among the severe trials to which he was subjected while at sea, was that of seeing his brother, who was lieutenant of the same vessel in which he served himself, die in his arms. After the destruction of nearly the whole fleet, he finally succeeded in landing at Cadiz, and reached Madrid in 1590. It seems almost incredible, that, notwithstanding all he suffered in that disastrous expedition, he was able to compose his mind so far as to write the greater part of his "Hermosura de Angelica," while exposed to the combined attacks of the British fleet and the storms which raged nearly all the time he was at sea. Yet it was one of his happiest efforts.

As the title implies, the whole story turns on the beauty of Angelica. Without attempting so fruitless a task as to analyze a poem which is composed of fragments but loosely put together, we will remark briefly, in passing, that a certain King of Seville, who dies for grief after his wife has died of the same passion on marrying him, bequeathed his kingdom to that person, whether man or woman, who shall be pronounced by seven royal judges superior to every other candidate in personal charms. Claimants of both sexes came from all parts of the world, many of them not only devoid of all pretensions to beauty, but decidedly repulsive from their deformity. But the author makes skilful use of this vanity by describing the different candidates, and contrasting them with each other; and then giving his opinions of the royal judges appointed to decide the question. Thus, Nereyden, Queen of Media, was so ugly as to frighten all children who saw her; but her appearance enables the poet to introduce the heroine at a time when her beauty will produce the greatest effect:

"Phantom of Lethe, wherefore art thou seen,
An inky spot upon this tablet white,
And all unwelcome as the birds obscene,
Who to the feast of Phineus took their flight?
Thinkest thou the foulest shall be named for queen,
Or hast thy mirror thus deceived thy sight?
From Cytherea's temple haste away,
Nor with thy presence mar her holiday!

"Yet thou art welcome here, as is the cloud
That gathers in the east before the day,
And with its tempering mantle serves to shroud
The orb of fire, which slowly wins its way;
So art thou welcome here, where else the crowd
Too suddenly had felt the dazzling ray,
When that Cathayan day-star on the sight,
Arose in all the lustre of her light."*

This is much better than the description of the heroine which follows it, because the latter is too minute, too cold, and too much unlike nature; although the author himself regarded it as not only the best passage in the whole poem, but the best he ever wrote. On the contrary, he thought his description of Medora nothing more than a commonplace transition one, which serves, from its comparative inanity, to set off another in which he had reason to feel some interest, but it is vastly superior to the description which it was intended to embellish:

"And with her he, at whose success and joy
The jealous world such ills had suffer'd, came,
Now king, whom late as slave did kings employ,
The young Medora, happy envied name!
Scarce twenty years had seen the lovely boy,
As ringlet locks and yellow down proclaim;
Fair was his height, and grave to gazers seemed
Those eyes which where they turned with love and softness beamed.

"Tender was he, and of a gentler kind,
A softer frame than haply knighthood needs;
To pity apt, to music much inclin'd,
In language haughty, somewhat meek in deeds;
Dainty in dress, and of accomplish'd mind,
A wit that kindles and a tongue that leads;
Gay, noble, kind, and generous to the sight,
On foot a gallant youth, on horse an airy knight."†

The judges give their opinions in turn, according to

---

* "A donde vas fantasma del Letheo,
Mancha de escura tinta en blanco raso?
Harpia entre las mesas de Fineo,
Aragne entre las musas del Parnaso?
Piensas que el premio se concede al feo?
Hante enganado o el espejo a caso?
Sal del templo de Venus, y no acuerdes
Que se apaguen en ti sus hachas verdes.
Mas bien sera que vayas como niebla
Para que venga el sol con dulce salva
Por cuya sombra y frigida tiniebla
Qual suele por la noche rompa el alva.
Que ya de resplandores cerea y puebla,
Y de tus nubes nos defienda y salva
La estrella de la Reyna del Cartharya
Que deshara tu sombra con so rayo."

† "Entró con ella aquel que tantos danos
Cansó en el mundo por su dicha y gozo,
Aquel esclavo, rey de mil estranos,
Aquel dichoso y envidiado mozo;
Era Medoro un mozo de veinte anos,
Ensortijado el pelo, y rubio el bozo,
De u ediana estatura, y de ojos graves,
Graves mirados, y en mirar suaves.
Tierno en extremo, y algo afeminado,
Mas de lo que merece un caballero,
Gran Horador, y musico extremado,
Humilde en obras, y en palabras fiero;
Guardado en ambar, siempre regalado,
Sutil, discreto, vario, lisongero,
Noble, apacible, alegre generoso,
A pie gallardo, y á caballo ayroso."

their own notions of beauty. That in which this is done, is undoubtedly the most humorous part of the poem, if not the most poetical. The following passage, though rather brief, will serve as a specimen:

"One grave old judge affirm'd it was their place
The unerring laws of beauty to define,
And if the form accorded with the face,
As sculptors try their work by rule and line,
And as from right proportion natural grace
Is the result, he therefore must opine
Concerning Thisbe's claim, that they should see
If all were due scale and just degree.

"Another sage one thought the counsel sound,
For beauty is the symmetry of parts,
And in this symmetry when all are bound
There is the magnet which attracts all hearts;
The separate charm which then in each is found,
Harmonious union to the whole imparts,
And Beauty therefore bears, when these agree,
The names of concord and of harmony."*

As might be expected in such a case, no two of the judges agree in their definitions of beauty. After they have wearied themselves not a little, wrangling with each other as to who the candidate is that is entitled to the bequest, one of the spectators is made to address them, but at respectful distance, in a strain the loveliness and spirit of which may be inferred from the following lines:

"O dotards, through your spectacles who pry,
And ask the measure of a lovely face;
Measure the influence of a woman's eye;
And you may then, I ween, compute the space
That intervenes between the earth and sky."†

On his return from Madrid after the failure of the Armada, he became secretary first to the Marquis of Malpica, and subsequently to the Marquis of Sarico, afterwards known as Count de Lemos; while in the service of the latter noble-

---

*"Tal viejo dize que mirar importa
Si ygual el cuerpo con el rostro sea,
Qual suele escultor que el leno corta,
Y por medidas justas le tentea,
Que en la materia alarga, quita, acorta,
Para que salga lo que fue la ydea,
Que la beldad de Tisbe sin medida
Con arte quieren que se juzgue, y mida.
Otro le aprueva, y dize que consiste
En una union de miembros la hermosura
Y que si ygual qualquiera al otro assiste,
Entonces es perfeta la figura;
Y que de esta unidad se adorna y viste
Del cuerpo la acabada compostura;
Y que por esso la beldad tenia
El nombre de concordia y armonica."

†"Ocaduces juezes con antojos,
Quereis medir un rostro, un tierno pecho,
Medid el ayre de unos bellos ojos,
Y me direys del cielo al suelo el trecho."
Canto III. ff. 30.

man, in 1597, when he had reached his thirty-fifth year, he married Dona Juana de Guardio. Soon after he resigned his position in the household of the marquis, and henceforth he devoted himself exclusively to literature for a livelihood.

We are told that he lived very happily for two or three years after his second marriage; and the fact would seem to be confirmed by his poetical epistles, in several of which he alludes to it. Some of his biographers are so ill-natured, however, as to allege that if he was really happy at this period, it was not his wife that made him so; and it must be admitted that the charge is but too well founded. He had two children by his second wife: Charles, who died at seven years old; and Feliciana, who was born soon after, but whose mother did not survive her birth. All agree that he was much grieved at the death of his wife and son; but several add that his illegitimate daughter Marcela was born some weeks before Feliciana. We are further informed that he loved the former much more than the latter; nay, more than any other child, male or female, he ever had. She was the daughter of Dona Maria de Luxan, a lady remarkable both for her beauty and accomplishments; and who had made herself not less remarkable by her romantic attachment to the author of the *Arcadia*. By this lady he had also a son named Lope; but after the birth of the latter no more is heard of her. It is otherwise, however, both with her son and daughter. The former had the honor, when only fourteen years old, of taking part in the poetical ovation given in honor of St. Isadore, reading a poem on that occasion which elicited much applause. He preferred the profession of arms to that of literature, however, and was killed in a naval engagement with the Dutch and Turks, about a year after.

To his illegitimate daughter, Marcela, he dedicated his *El Remedio de la Desdicha*, in 1620, "with extraordinary expressions of admiration and affection," begging her, in his preface, to correct and read it, and praying that she may be happy in spite of the perfections which render earthly happiness almost impossible to her. The course which she subsequently pursued shows that he was right in regarding her as having no appreciation for the pleasures which the world can afford; for in one year after, we find her taking the veil and becoming a nun, when such were her beauty and accomplishments, and so much was she esteemed for her many virtues, that she could have married into one of the most respectable families

in Madrid. Her father poured forth his grief in a beautiful ode; he also found consolation in the great splendor that marked her retirement from the world; the king attending the ceremony in person, accompanied by the Duke de Sessa and other illustrious personages, all of whom were the personal friends and admirers of Lope. It is but justice to Marcela to say, that far from desiring any such display, she permitted it only in compliance with the earnest and repeated entreaties of her father, for whom she had the greatest admiration and affection. Even in her convent life she never forgot him. There is something peculiarly affecting in the request she made at his death. As her vows and feelings precluded her from returning to the world, even for the purpose of attending the funeral of her beloved father, she begged, as a particular favor, that the funeral procession might pass by the convent, so that she might get one look at his face before the grave closed on him for ever. We may add that it is creditable to all concerned, that her request was not refused.

Although both the illegitimate children are spoken of in the highest terms, the fact that Lope had such while his wife lived is urged as evidence that he was not so much grieved for the death of the latter, as Montalvan would have the world believe. Indeed, some go so far as to allege that he was glad of it. This conclusion they draw from certain sonnets of his, and it must be admitted that those alluded to are but too well calculated to justify the worst suspicion entertained against him in that respect. But we will allow our readers to judge for themselves, by extracting the most remarkable of those verses, as translated by Lord Holland, and giving the original in a foot note, for the benefit of those acquainted with the Castilian This we do all the more readily, because whatever may be the propriety or impropriety of the author's real meaning or design, it cannot be denied that these stanzas are in the true poetic vein:

"Seven long and tedious years did Jacob serve,
And short had been the term, if it had found
Its end desired. To Leah he was bound,
And must by service of seven more deserve
His Rachel. Thus will strangers lightly swerve
From their pledged word. Yet time might well repay
Hope's growing debt, and Patience might be crown'd;
And the slow season of expectance past,
True love with ample recompense at last
Requite the sorrows of this hard delay.

Alas for me, to whose unhappy doom
No such blest end appears! Ill fate is his
Who hopes for Rachel *in the world to come.*
And *chain'd to Leah drags his life in this.*"*

Some think that this was intended for Phillis; others infer from it that the author was in love with another man's wife. The following lines, written on a subsequent occasion, but in the same strain, seem to strengthen the latter opinion:

" When snows before the genial breath of spring
Dissolve, and our great mother reassumes
Her robe of green; the meadow breathes perfumes,
Loud sings the thrush, the bees are on the wing,
The fresh grass grows, the young lambs feed at will.
But not to thee, my heart, doth Nature bring
The joy that this sweet season should instil.
Thou broodest always on thy chorish'd ill
Absence is no sore grief—it is a glass
Wherein true love from falsehood may be known;
Well may the pain be borne *which hath an end;*
But woe to him *whose ill-placed hopes attend*
Another's life, and who till that shall pass
In hopeless expectation wastes his own."†

In the same volume that contained the "Angelic Beauty," was also first published *La Dragontea*, an heroic poem in ten books, on Sir Francis Drake. This is one of the most singular productions ever written. Its object is to give full expression to the national hatred towards Drake. At the end of the argument to the first book is a long list of names and places. To this is added a note, in which the reader is informed that as often as he meets with the word Dragon, he is to understand by it the person of Francis Drake. Some of the other English names are rendered into Spanish, as follows: Hawkins is called Achines; Thomas Baskerville

---

* Sirvio Jacob los siete largos anos
Breves, si al fin qual la esperanza fuera;
A Lia goza, y a Rachel espera
Otros siete despues, Horando engamos,
Assi guardan, palabra los estranos.
Pero en effecto vive, y considera,
Que la podra gazar antes que muera,
Y que tuvieron terminos sus danos;
Triste de mi, sin limite que mida.
Lo que un engano al sufrimiento cuesta,
Y sin remedio que el agravio pida.
Ay de aquel alma a padecer dispuesta
Que espera su Rachel en la otra vida,
Y tiene a Lia pa ra siempre en esta.

Segunda Parte de fas Rimas de Lope de Vega. Barcelona, 1604. Soneto V.

† Quando la Madre antigua reverdeze,
Bello pastor y a quanto vive aplaze,
La zerva nace, la nacida crece,
Canta el silguero, el corderillo pace,
Tu pecho aquien su pena satisface
Del general contonto se entristece.
No es mucho mal la ansencia, que es espejo
Quando en agua la nieve se deshaze,
Por en Sol que en el Aries resplandeze,
De la cierta verdad, o la fingida;
Si espera fin, ninguna pena es pena.
Ay del que tiene por su mal consejo
El remedio impossible de su vida
En la esparanza de la nuerte agena.

figures prominently in the poem as Don Thomas Vasuile, and Cavendish is metamorphosed into Candir.

The first book opens with the prayers of Christianity, in the form of a beautiful woman, who presents Spain, Italy, and America in the court of heaven, and prays God to protect them all against what the poet calls "that Protestant Scotch pirate." It is but justice to Lope to remark that in no other light than that of a corsair was Drake regarded on the Peninsula, either in Spain or Portugal, before the destruction of the great Armada. His being second in command of the British fleet sent against the Armada, raised him even in the eyes of his enemies to the dignity of a legitimate warrior; and the historians of Spain and Portugal speak of him accordingly. That it was not for nothing he got the former character, may be inferred from the fact that he had scoured the whole Spanish coast, from Cadiz to Cape St. Vincent, the year before the destruction of the Armada, and had sunk, or carried off, at least ten thousand tons of their larger ships, besides some fifty or sixty smaller vessels.

The author explains the object of his poem in his preface. He tells us that he had two causes for writing it; one was that the people might be undeceived in their opinion of their enemy, the truth being that every grain of gold he had taken cost him much blood; the other, that oblivion might not cover the important victory which had at last been gained over him. In addition to this, he was anxious that the king should see the valor of the Spaniards, and the miserable end to which their worst enemy had come. He expected that the work would be very popular; but ten long books, containing little more than personal abuse, is not likely to be much read by any class. If the Spaniards hated Elizabeth and the English as much as Lope thought, they preferred to evince their hatred in some other way than that of reading the *Dragontea*. True, it contains not a few passages that are well worth reading; but as a whole, the work may be regarded as the least successful he has ever written.

A very different performance was his *El Perigrino en su Patria*, published the same year. It embraces the story of two lovers, who, after many and various adventures in Spain and Portugal, are carried into captivity among the Moors, and finally return home as pilgrims by way of Italy. The entire romance is in the form of five books, and is one of the most highly finished of all his productions. Its chief

beauty consists in its episodes, and the fine lyrics scattered through it with a bountiful hand; all of which are ingeniously interwoven with the narrative. None of his works seem to have been so universally read. One reason assigned for this, apart from its genuine merit, is that the poet availed himself of his own adventures at Valencia and elsewhere, in order to give piquancy to the story. Be this as it may, it contains many strange incidents, and at the same time is truer to nature throughout than any other performance of his, except perhaps his *El Azero de Madrid* (The Madrid Steel), which is said to have suggested to Molière the idea of his "Medicin Malgré Lui." Nor does the latter, truly excellent as it is, equal the original in spirit or vigor. This is particularly true of the portraiture of the heroine, which in the Spanish play is exceedingly lively, piquant, and natural. Another character which is admirably drawn, is that of the lady's aunt, who, while acting as a duenna to her, pretends to be absorbed in religion, and exposes her own hypocrisy by falling in love. A passage of any extent extracted from almost any part of the piece would show that we do not exaggerate its merit. We should do more justice to the author by quoting from the second or third act than from the first; but the latter gives a better idea of the skilful manner in which the character of the heroine is contrasted with that of her aunt. Lisardo, the hero, and Riselo, his friend, make their first appearance before the door of a fashionable church in Madrid, where they watch eagerly for the door to open, so that Lisardo may see the lady with whom he is in love. The friend grows weary as group after group pass out, and declares he cannot remain any longer. Just as he is about to leave Belisa appears, accompanied by her aunt, Theodora, who is already engaged in lecturing her:

"*Theodora.* Show more of gentleness and modesty;—
Of gentleness in walking quietly,
Of modesty in looking only down
Upon the earth you tread.
Belisa. 'Tis what I do.
Theodora. What? When you're looking straight towards that man?
Belisa. Did you not bid me look upon the earth?
And what is he but just a bit of it?
Theodora. I said the earth whereon you tread, my niece.
Belisa. But that whereon I tread is hidden quite
With my own petticoat and walking-dress.
Theodora. Words such as these become no well-bred maid.
But, by your mother's blessed memory,
I'll put an end to all your pretty tricks;—
What? You look back at him again?

Belisa. Who? I?
Theodora. Yes, you;—and make him secret signs besides.
Belisa. Not I. 'Tis only that you troubled me
With teasing questions and perverse replies,
So that I stumbled and looked round to see
Who would prevent my fall.
Rielo (*to Lisardo*). She falls again.
Be quick and help her.
Lisardo (*to Belisa*). Pardon me, lady,
And forgive my glove.
Theodora. Who ever saw the like?
Belisa. I thank you, sir, you saved me from a fall.
Lisardo. An angel, lady, might have fallen so;
Or stars that shine with heaven's own blessed light.
Theodora. I, too, can fall; but 't is upon your trick.
Good gentleman, farewell to you!
Lisardo. Madam,
Your servant. (Heaven save us from such spleen!)
Theodora. A pretty fall you made of it; and now I hope
You'll be content, since they assisted you.
Belisa. And you no less content, since now you have
The means to tease me for a week to come.
Theodora. But why again do you turn back your head?
Belisa. Why, sure you think it wise and wary
To notice well the place I stumbled at,
Lest I should stumble there when next I pass.
Theodora. Mischief befall you! But I know your ways!
You'll not deny this time you looked upon the youth?
Belisa. Deny it? No!
Theodora. You dare confess it, then?
Belisa. Be sure I dare. You saw him help me,—
And would you have me fail to thank him for it?
Theodora. Go to! Come home! Come home!
Belisa. Now we shall have
A pretty scolding cooked up out of this."

The scene of the quack doctor, in the same play, is another capital portraiture. Those who read it will, we think, agree with us that authors of nearly three hundred years ago had much more courage, and took much more pains to put the public on its guard against swindlers of the quack genus, than authors of the present day, although the tribe do vastly more harm now in one year, in one of our large cities, than they could then in all Spain in seven years, for the obvious reason that the Spanish quacks had not the press to aid them in proclaiming their wonderful powers. But, disregarding the order of time, we pass on to another play, which, although it belongs to altogether a different class from that of "The Madrid Steel," is marked, in common with the latter, by many fine touches of nature; it shows that if Lope de Vega often transcends the bounds of probability, and sometimes seems to set reason and common sense

at defiance, he does not do so from ignorance of the human heart.

Indeed, we have evidence enough throughout his writings that he occasionally indulged in extravagance, not that his taste or judgment approved of it, but because that was the kind that happened to be most agreeable to his countrymen in his time. This he tells us himself in his "New Art of Composing Comedies" (*El Arte Nuovo de hacer Comedias*), a work in which he shows that he was perfectly acquainted with the classic models and with the most approved precepts of criticism, including those of the Stagyrite. "But," he says, "he who now follows rules of art dies without glory and without recompense for his labor, so easy is it for custom to overcome reason. When I compose a comedy," he adds, "I shut up under triple locks all precepts; I remove from my study Plautus and Terence, lest I might hear their cries; for the truth calls with a loud voice from those mute volumes. I write, therefore, according to the dramatic art, invented by those who wished to secure the applause of the multitude. In short, it is the public that pays us, and it is but fair that we should write absurdities in order to please it." Before we condemn Lope for this, let us bear in mind that Shakespeare, who was his contemporary, was not less indifferent than he to forms or principles; in other words, he was not less ready to set all rules and precepts at defiance. We do not mean, however, to compare the genius of De Vega to that of Shakespeare; for highly gifted as the former was, as evidenced especially by his astonishing fecundity and his extraordinary facility of writing, we hold that he was vastly inferior, as a delineator of man and his passions, to the latter. Still, even Shakespeare has written nothing more tender, nothing that more readily finds an echo in every breast, than many episodes we find in the works of De Vega. The piece to which we have just alluded affords an instance of this—we mean his *El Principe Perfeto*, in which his main object is to give an idea of a perfect prince, under the character of Don John of Portugal, son of Alfonso the Fifth, and contemporary with Ferdinand and Isabella. It would occupy too much of our space to attempt an analysis of *The Perfect Prince*. Let it suffice to remark, that Don Juan de Sousa, the king's favorite, is twice sent by him to Spain on embassies of consequence, and that while residing there, he resides in the family of a gentleman connected with him by blood, to whose daughter, Leonora, he makes love, and he wins

her affections. He returns to Portugal several times, but forgets his plighted faith. At last she comes with her father to Lisbon; even there he refuses to remember his obligations. Finally, when all other means fail, she presents herself to the king; Leonora exclaims, as she enters the audience hall:

Prince, whom in peace and war men perfect call,
Listen a woman's cry!

King. Begin;—I hear.

Leonora. Fadrique—he of ancient Lara's house,
And governor of Sevillé—is my sire.

King. Pause there, and pardon first the courtesy
That owes a debt to thy name and to his,
Which ignorance alone could fail to pay.

Leonora. Such condescending gentleness, my lord,
Is worthy of the wisdom and the wit
Which through the world are blazoned and admired.—
But to my tale. Twice came there to Castile
A knight from this thy land, whose name I hide
Till all his frauds are manifest. For thou,
My lord, dost love him in such wise, that, wert
Thou other than thou art, my true complaints
Would fear to seek a justice they in vain
Would strive to find. Each time within our house
He dwelt a guest, and from the very first
He sought my love.

King. Speak on, and let not shame
Oppress thy words; for to the judge and priest
Alike confession's voice should boldly come.

Leonora. I was deceived. He went and left me sad
To mourn his absence; for of them he is
Who leave behind their knightly, nobler parts,
When they themselves are long since fled and gone.
Again he came, his voice more sweetly tuned,
More siren-like than ever. I heard the voice,
Nor knew its hidden fraud. O would that Heaven
Had made us, in its highest justice, deaf,
Since tongues so false it gave to men! He lured,
He lured me as the fowler lures the bird
In snares and meshes hid beneath the grass.
I struggled, but in vain; for Love, heaven's child,
Has power the mightiest fortress to subdue.
He pledged his knightly word,—in writing pledged it,
Trusting that afterwards, in Portugal,
The debt and all might safely be denied;—
As if the heavens were narrower than the earth,
And justice not supreme. In short, my lord,
He went; and, proud and vain, the banners bore
That my submission marked, not my defeat;
For where love is, there comes no victory.
His spoils he carried to his native land,
As if they had been torn in heathen war
From Africa; such as in Arcila,
In earliest youth, thyself with glory won;
Or such as now, from shores remote, thy ships

Bring home,—dark slaves, to darker slavery.
No written word of his came back to me.
My honor wept its obsequies, and built its tomb
With Love's extinguished torches. Soon, the prince,
Thy son, was wed with our Infanta fair,—
God grant it for a blessing to both realms!—
And with her, as ambassador, my sire
To Lisbon came, and I with him. But here—
Even here—his promises that knight denies,
And so disheartens and despises me,
That, if your Grace no remedy can find,
The end of all must be the end of life,—
So heavy is my misery.

King. That scroll?
Thou hast it?

Leonora. Surely. It were an error,
Not to be repaired, if I had lost it.

King. It cannot be but I should know the hand,
If he who wrote it in my household serve.

Leonora. This is the scroll, my lord.

King. And John de Sosa's is
The signature! But yet, unless mine eyes
Had seen and recognized his very hand,
I never had believed the tale thou bring'st;—
So highly deem I of his faithfulness.

One of Lope's greatest as well as most elaborate works is his *Jerusalem Conquistada* (Jerusalem Conquered), which was published in 1609. The author calls it "a tragic epic," and it must be admitted that, whatever may be the faults of the poem, the title is not inappropriate. Writing about himself to the Duke of Sessa, nearly four years before its publication, he says: "I wrote it in my best years, and with a different purpose from that of other works written in my youth, when the passions have more power."* It is in twenty books of octave rhymes, making in all more than twenty-two thousand verses. Yet it was twice reprinted within the ten years succeeding its first publication, and it has been reprinted ten times since. This would show, in the absence of all other evidence, that it possesses merit of no mean order, as indeed it really does. Its graceful, easy, and lively style, its romantic and often charming episodes, its pretty natural visions, its allegorical personages, and above all its love adventures, form so agreeable a *mélange*, and are generally so skilfully interwoven with the narrative, that those who are startled most by its extravagances and its frequent violations of historic truth, cannot help being fascinated in its perusal. A remark or two will explain here the nature of the incongruities alluded to. In choosing his hero he

* Shack, Nachhage, 1854, p. 33.

preferred Richard Cœur de Lion to Godfrey de Bologne, and yet undertakes to rival Tasso in the *chef-d'œuvre* of the latter. In the progress of the poem he seems to have discovered that he should rely for success on some other hero, and accordingly introduces a rival in the person of Alphonso the Eighth, King of Castile, who it is certain was never in Palestine at all. Another serious defect is that the real subject of the poem ends in the eighteenth book, by the return of both Richard and Alphonso. In every other respect, however, the facts of history are adhered to with tolerable fidelity. But after all, it is not for the historical information to be derived from a poem that we read it with more or less avidity, but chiefly for the qualities which we have already spoken of as characterizing the "Jerusalem Conquered" in a high degree.

It is nevertheless true, that where there are blemishes, it is not only the privilege, but the duty, of the critic to point them out. This has been done in the case of Lope both at home and abroad. While he was engaged in writing the work under consideration, but not until some specimens of it had been seen by the critics, a sonnet was published and widely circulated, the burden of which was that he should not proceed in so rash an attempt as to rival Tasso. This the author and his friends seem to have attributed to Cervantes, but with no sufficient reason. On the contrary, there were various reasons why the author of Don Quixote ought not to have been accused of any such conduct; but one or two will be sufficient for our purpose. One is, that he had written a complimentary sonnet, which was prefixed to the *Dragontea;* the other, that he had spoken in terms of high praise in his *Viage del Pernaso* of Lope de Vega. The mistake of the latter was, not to bear in mind that there were many others from whom he had reason to expect the like more than from Cervantes, who was sufficiently conscious of his own superior powers to be jealous of Lope or any other Spanish writer of his time. Our author soon found, however, that he had some reason to turn his suspicion in another direction. Of this we find an interesting proof in another "Journey to Parnassus," written by the Portuguese satirist, Dioga de Sousa, and from which we extract the following passage, merely premising that it hits off the faults and foibles of Lope very happily:

"Two days in that great city did I tarry,
Delaying my departure, in regard

That I might to the god Apollo carry
A line of notice from the darling Bard
Lopez, whom as his life he seem'd to prize.
I found him in the lowest damp retreat
Of all the wide and fertile vale which lies
Between Punhete and Pyrene's feet.
A dish of season'd compliments I brought,
Kneaded with salt and butter was the paste,
And more to please his palate, as I thought,
Sweetened with honey to the poet's taste:
Presenting this, I ventured to require
A letter to Apollo for his favor,
And, if he deign'd to grant my bold desire,
Another for the Rhymers of strong savor.
If you should visit Sparta, he replied,
A city of Arcadia which I know,
(Having been there myself), I will provide
Some friendly introductions ere you go.
Yet a long time had now elapsed, he said,
Since aught of Lord Anfriso he could hear,
Nor knew he if he were alive or dead.
I answered, Sir, I shall not travel there;
Nor will I enter in the Holy Land,
Except with caution and in safe disguise;
Because the school-boys there, I understand,
Inveigh against your Reverence with loud cries:
For they complain that what Torquato did
Hath been unhappily undone by you.
Thereat the indignant Lopez at my head
With furious force his weighty inkstand threw.
I saw his sudden purpose, and in fear
Turning my back, began all speed to fly:
The heavy weapon reached me in the rear,
And rearward I returned a long loud sigh.
Humbly I then essayed to supplicate
The offended author's favor as before:
But even while I spake, the Bard irate
Drew back, and in my face he shut the door."

Not a few of the incidents of the "Jerusalem" are singular. Thus, in the third book the Count of Tripoli is killed by a nightmare, and the mode of his death is duly described in harmonious verse.* Another odd scene occurs in the fourth

* "Two kinds of dreams there be; of softest down
The gentle one is framed, the sterner kind
Of lead, beneath whose painful weight the breast
Labors and struggles, fearfully opprest.

"What wouldst thou? trembling the apostate cries,
And as he spake essays to lift his head;
Vainly he makes the effort, vainly tries
To escape from that encumbent load of lead.
Fixed by the oppressive weight, he cannot rise,
The throttling spectre pins him to the bed,
Hardly the wretch inhales a loud-drawn breath
And opes his eyes to see the face of death.

book, the opening of which represents Jerusalem as standing before the throne of God, and relating the history of the Jews from the time when they were miraculously brought out of Egypt, down to their present captivity under Saladin. This curious episode occupies twenty-eight stanzas, which form by no means the least interesting part of the poem. Lord Holland speaks of the whole, as compared with the "Angelica," as "confusion worse confounded," but it is evident that if his lordship has read it at all, he has done so hastily. At all events, a much more reliable critic* has given a very different estimate of the "Jerusalem:" "But," says the author of *Thalaba*, "there is more vigor of thought in it, and more felicity of expression, than in any other of his long poems." The same judicious critic makes allowance for the prominence given to the Spaniards contrary to the strict truth of history. "The subject," he says, "is that crusade of which Richard Cœur de Lion was the hero; but as the Castilians bore a part in it, they, of course, are preferred to the place of honor by their countryman." This is no more than what Virgil has done for the Romans in his Æneid, in which he represents the Trojans as the ancestors of the Romans. At all events, the poem must not be overlooked by any one who desires to form an accurate estimate of the genius of Lope de Vega.

The "Jerusalem" was followed appropriately enough by "The Shepherds of Bethlehem" (*Pastores de Belen*), a pastoral in prose and verse in five books, which presents sacred history in accordance with the most popular traditions of the church, from the birth of Mary to the arrival of the holy family in Egypt. Many passages of this are in bad taste, and they were severely censured as such when the work was first published. It is not the less true, however, that it contains some charming narratives, and as fine specimens of the lyrical style as are to be found in any literature. Thus, for example, the song of the Virgin lulling the child Jesus to sleep, in the palm grove, is one of the happiest efforts of its kind ever made; and as such it has been translated not only into every

"In vain he seeks to wrestle with the weight
Which will not loose its miserable prey:
Helpless and hopeless now he yields to fate,
Nor hath he tongue to speak, nor heart to pray;
Down falls the quivering jaw; in this estate,
Through the wide open mouth Death makes his way;
Life meets him, and as each the way would win,
They know not which is out, or which is in."

* Southey.

European language, but into several oriental languages, cluding the Turkish and the Persian. The same year (16 he published "Religious Ballads" and "Thoughts," in pr the latter of which he pretended to have translated from Latin of *Gabriel Padecopeo* (a sort of anagram of Lope Vega).

It is proper we should remark here, that at this t Lope had become an ecclesiastic. This step he took in 1(very soon after his daughter had taken the veil. He then about thirty-eight years old, and it is due to his mem as well as to the cause of truth and justice, to say, whatever may have been his indiscretions prior to this per he led a virtuous and blameless life from the time he bec a priest until his death. Writers of all religious denomi tions mention this fact to his credit.* It is added, that altho there are objectionable passages in several pieces of his wri after his becoming an ecclesiastic, he was always ready to punge them when called upon to do so by the authoritie the church. He also evinced a ready and implicit obedi to his superiors when the Archbishop of Madrid nounced the theatre as a school of vice and depravity; he subsequently confined himself exclusively to what w nominally at least religious poems. We are told tha 1820–22, he found two occasions for exercising his talent the beatification and canonization of St. Isadore. As re sentations in ordinary theatres were forbidden by Church, he caused a temporary structure to be erected in fi of the church of St. Andrew. On a platform prepared the purpose, Lope read poems in honor of the occasion f the principal literary men of the day, including Jauri Pantaleon, Montalvan, Zarate, Guillen de Castro, Espi Calderon, Lope himself, and his son already alluded to. T years more recently there was another fête in honor of same saint, at which Lope read two poems, one on the fancy, and the other on the youth of St. Isadore. He

* "He devoted himself to pious works," says Ticknor, "as his father done; visited the hospitals regularly; resorted daily to a particular church tered a secular religious congregation; and finally at Toledo, in 160 cording to Navarrete, received the tonsure and became a priest. The next he joined the same brotherhood of which Cervantes was afterwards a mer In 1625, he entered the congregation of the native priesthood of Madrid, was so faithful and exact in the performance of his duties that in 1628 he elected to be its chief chaplain. He is, therefore, for the twenty-six latter of his life, to be regarded as strictly connected with the Spanish church, a devoting to its daily service some portion of his time."—*Hist. of Spanish L ture, Vol. II., p.* 164.

his own poems on each occasion under an assumed name, that of Tomé de Bourgillos; but notwithstanding this, gained more applause than all the other poets together. This decided preference induced him to write several other pieces, the chief characteristics of which were burlesque humor, lively wit, and caustic, but not offensive satire. It was at this time he produced his *Gatomachia*, or *Battle of the Cats*, undoubtedly one of the best mock heroic poems in any language.

Its subject is a contest between two cats for the love of a third, and it extends to seven cantos, making in all two thousand five hundred lines. It might well seem incredible that any author could continue to interest the reader throughout so long a poem, without introducing any other characters than cats; but the truth is that that strange performance becomes more and more lively, spirited, and fascinating as it proceeds; so that the critics of all nations concur in the opinion that the two last cantos are the most attractive of all. Perhaps the secret of its great popularity at home and abroad is that it so happily and amusingly parodies several epic poets of different countries, especially Ariosto, and is equally successful and humorous in caricaturing old ballads, odes, sonnets, &c. Next to Don Quixote, it has always been the most popular in Spain of all works whatever. This will not seem strange when it is borne in mind that the reader is reminded at every line of the similar quarrels of men and women, and the fuss made about them by poets, who narrate them as if they were the sublime performances of gods and goddesses; in other words, although the subject throughout is cats, as we have said, in no other poem has Lope de Vega, or perhaps any other Spanish poet, delineated human nature so faithfully, especially when it is influenced by love and the various other feelings and motives which lead men to a quarrel with each other for the possession of a "better half." The peculiar jealousy of the Spaniards is portrayed with a degree of fidelity which is absolutely inimitable. We have no poetical version of the *Gatomachia* before us; and it cannot be expected that a prose translation will give any adequate idea of the humor and spirit of the original; yet we think that a passage or two even of the latter will show that we do not exaggerate the genuine merit of the poem. In the second canto the heroine is reading a letter from one of her lovers, and is so unfortunate as to be seen by another:

"Zapequilda had proceeded thus far, when the jealous Marramaquiz,

who, from the summit of an adjoining roof, was contemplating this horr ble treachery, suddenly appeared, and furious, seized with one paw tl fatal letter, and pounced with the other on the plateful of delicacies. Tl unfortunate Garraf stood there stupefied, like a school-boy caught in tl act by a severe master. Marramaquiz, no longer able to restrain himse gave him two or three blows with his terrific claws, then taking him l the nape of the neck, he threw him into the air, where the unfortuna messenger turned and twisted about. So, at tennis, a vigorous and skilf player throws to a distance the ball which his bat has struck.

"This done, Marramaquiz, his eyes sparkling, and foaming at tl mouth, tore his rival's letter to pieces, and threatened the terrified Zap quilda. At the same time, as if to assuage his fury, he destroyed the gr nish of bacon, eggs, and fine kernels, and cursed the hand which prepar them for that day's dinner. Who would ever have ascribed the jealou of love to such causes? At last, however, our cat took flight. You shou have seen her run; she was so nimble that you would have compared h to that amazon who ran over a field of wheat without bending the ears she passed (which is not one of the least suspicious stories which vene able antiquity has transmitted to us). While running, she invoked tl god of love; she vowed that if she escaped safely from her terrible gallar she would offer up to him next season a bow and arrows of costly wor manship."

It matters little what canto we turn to; there are exce lent passages to be found in each—nay, at almost ever page. Passing to the sixth canto we come to that scene i which the heroine, after being duly wedded to her favorit knight, is carried off like a second Helen, by an impudei rival. The injured and bereaved husband calls a council c his friends, all of whom give him advice according as the are brave or timid, rash or prudent law-abiding or law-d fying:

"'Friends and relatives, I shall not employ vain eloquence to point ou to you the misfortune which you have witnessed, and of which, accordir to custom, I was the last to be informed. Do I need words to rouse yo Do noble hearts require long speeches? The paleness of my face and m sighs will tell more than I can, and a silent grief is not less eloquent tha Demosthenes, especially when speaking before an assembly, which, fi wisdom, can only be compared to the Roman senate. My wife has bee carried off, and I demand vengeance!'

"The assembly was moved, and most of the cats gave Mizifouf unequiv cal proofs of real sympathy.

"After this first movement, a cat named Big-belly spoke. He was a c of consummate prudence and venerable aspect. We must add, that h baldness was not caused by the disease called scald head, but by a blo given him by a servant one day, when, profiting by her looking off ou moment from some tripe she was cleaning, he seized hold of one end an carried it up on the roof, so that the other end remained in the kitche thus forming a long cord, by means of which one might have found one way about the house, like the thread of the Cretan labyrinth.

"Big-belly rose and said, with a grave and majestic air, 'It is wit reason, my friends, that you testify such sympathy to Mizifouf, and yo owe help and protection to a stranger who has left his native land to liv amongst us as a brother; and even if not for his sake, you ought to pro

to the world, by some striking example, that beauty is not be outraged with impunity.'

"To which Kiddy, speaking like a young cat as he was, answered, 'If this concerned me personally,' said he, boastingly, 'Marramaquiz would already have suffered the punishment he deserves, for I would have torn out his eyes with my claws.'

"But Fighter looked fixedly at him, and said, 'It would be better to send a challenge, according to the manners of Castile, to the most valiant cat who ever ran in the gutters.'

"'That is not my opinion,' said Sharp. 'Is it not folly to expose one's life against an individual who has behaved improperly? and is it not established that there should be no challenge in cases of treachery? My advice is, that the injured one should take a cross-bow—that, armed thus, he should at night await the offender at the corner of a roof, and there kill him, without compromising himself.'

"'Yes,' instantly replied Scratcher, who was a very distinguished cat. 'Yes, this revenge would be excellent, if certain. But there is no reckoning on it with so careful a cat as Marramaquiz. In my opinion it would be better to bring the ravisher to justice, and proceed legally against him; doubtless death would be the reward of his crimes.'

"'That would be called cowardice,' instantly replied Biter. 'Besides, what is the use of a law-suit in cases like this. Is there not always a deal of idle gossiping which a man must avoid? And who does not know the interminable length of law suits? We lose patience and life before judgment is passed. I therefore think the best justice is the one we get for ourselves by sword and pistol.'"

Our rapidly diminishing space obliges us to stop here, although some of the speakers have yet to present their views.

So numerous are the works of De Vega, that it would be impossible even to glance at one-fourth of them in one article; for he is beyond all comparison the most prolific writer whose multifarious productions are well attested. Be it remembered that his dramatic works alone fill twenty-six quarto volumes, which were published between 1609 and 1647; while he was yet living, twenty of these thick, closely-printed quartos appeared. The six last volumes included *Autos Sacramentales*, *Loas y Entremeses*, ballads, sonnets, &c., &c.*

We have already devoted more space to this article than we had intended, yet there are two or three of Lope's pieces to which we must refer, however briefly, before we close. We should also be glad to speak of his relations with his brother authors; but to do justice to this branch of the subject would require an article by itself. We may remark in passing,

* In 1803 he gave a list of three hundred and forty-one separate productions; in 1609, the number had increased to four hundred and eighty-three; in 1618, to eight hundred; in 1619, to nine hundred; in 1824, to one thousand and seventy. After his death, in 1635, his friend, Montalvan, announced that he found, on examination of the author's manuscripts, that his dramatic compositions alone amounted to eighteen hundred pieces, and four hundred *autos*. *Parnaso Espan.*, Vol. iii. p. 125.

however, that except in the case of Cervantes, the co
duct of Lope towards all his contemporaries was fra
and generous. It does not appear that he entertained t
least feeling of jealousy towards any of the rest; where
nearly all were jealous of him, and they often gave ve
to that feeling by giving him all the annoyance in th
power. Some think that this is the reason why he co
plains as he does at the close of his "Jerusalem Conquered
but he speaks of himself, not only as ruined and neglect
and struggling with domestic embarrassments, but also a
banished man, and in that instance alone resembling Ov
This is not consistent with the theory that it was the atta
of his rivals which caused him to complain, and yet in t
motto to his "Jerusalem" he gives his readers to underst
that he is aware that an unfavorable impression had go
abroad against the work; for he expresses the wish that
be read first, and afterwards despised, if it deserves th
fate, &c.*

In several of the dramas of De Vega, Columbus appears
one of the characters; but there is one in which he is ve
properly the chief, *El Nuovo Mundo* (The New Worl
This is by no means the happiest of our author's productio
although not only was it well received both in Spain and P
tugal, when first presented, but to this day it continues pop
lar in both countries. It embraces all that is interesting
the life of the great explorer, especially in that part of
comprised between his first effort to secure the countenance
Portugal, and his triumphant presentation of the spoils of t
New World to Ferdinand and Isabella, at Barcelona. T
piece is remarkable chiefly as a faithful embodiment of the
tional feeling in regard to America as a world rescued fr
Paganism. As usual, the author has introduced certain pers
ages who are different from those whom the facts of hist
would lead us to expect. He makes us acquainted, in
present instance, with sundry Moors, several American In
ans, besides a number of spiritual or allegorical beings, su
as Providence, Christianity, Idolatry, &c. No regard is had
unity of time or place, for the scenes are laid alternately
the plains of Granada at the moment of its fall, in differ
parts of Portugal, and in the ship of Columbus during
mutiny. The best part of the piece is that in which

* Legant prius et postea despiciant, ne videantur non ex judicio sed ex
præsumptione ignorata damnare.

simple and ignorant natives give expression to their fears and jealousies, although it is considerably marred by causing them to sing songs about Phœbus, Diana, and other deities whom they had never heard of before. In the mutiny scene, Columbus is made to represent himself as divinely inspired; thus, for example, he addresses his brother Bartholomew as follows:

"A hidden Deity still drives me on,
Bidding me trust the truth of what I feel,
And if I watch, or if I sleep, impels
The strong will boldly to work out its way.
But what is this that thus possesses me?
What spirit is it drives me onward thus?
Where am I borne? What is the road I take?
What track of destiny is this I tread?
And what the impulse that I blindly follow?
Am I not poor, unknown, a broken man,
Depending on the pilot's anxious trade?
And shall I venture on the mighty task,
To add a distant world to this we know?"

The Indians are occasionally made to express themselves with characteristic force and logic. Indeed there are some instances in which the Spaniards are in danger of being overcome by their arguments. It is the allegorical personages, however, who are made to say those stubborn things which it is most difficult to refute. Even Idolatry is allowed to be more logical than is altogether consistent with the requirements of Christianity, as may be seen from the following specimen:

"O Providence Divine, permit them not
To do me this most plain unrighteousness!
'Tis but base avarice that spurs them on,
Religion is the color and the cloak;
But gold and silver hid within the earth,
Are all they truly seek and strive to win."

Some of his plays on common life seem to vindicate Lope de Vega from the charge oftenest preferred against him by foreign critics, namely, that of making no earnest effort to portray the habits and customs of the people. Montalvan calls our attention to several of his dramas as a refutation of this, especially *El Cuerdo en Casa* (The Wise Man at Home), and it must be admitted that it fully justifies the argument he founds upon it. The hero, Mendo, is the son of a poor charcoal-burner, who has married the daughter of a respectable farmer, and is entirely content with his lot. Because he has made some money by his industry, certain of his neighbors, especially a lawyer's clerk, advise him to

assume the airs of a *hidalgo;* but he has always good reasons to show why it is better for him not to take such advice:

> "He that was born to live in humble state
> Makes but an awkward knight, do what you will.
> My father means to die as he has lived,
> The same plain collier that he always was;
> And I, too, must an honest ploughman die.
> 'Tis but a single step, or up or down;
> For men there must be that will plough and dig,
> And when the vase has once been filled, be sure
> 'Twill always savor of what first it held."

In a word, Mendo is a true portraiture; a type which would apply to other countries as well as to Spain. His description of the first sight he got of his future wife is such as to find an echo in every breast. Of a different character is the passage descriptive of the scene which took place at the christening of Mendo's first child; but it is sufficient to say of this, that it makes a nearer approach to "The Cottar's Saturday Night" by Burns, than any other scene which we can recal at the present moment.

One reason why Lope de Vega is not much read in this country or in England, is that most of his English and American critics have represented his religious pieces as little better than burlesques on all that Christians should hold to be most sacred. It is true that a similar extravagance and exaggeration are attributed to his writings in general; but it is those that are said to characterize his religious pieces that have excited the strongest prejudices against him. It cannot be denied that he often uses language which is in the highest degree hyperbolical; but we should not forget that the Spanish is vastly different in this respect, not only from the English, but from the Italian and French. What would seem highly improper as applied to the Deity, or to anything sacred, in the sober guise of the English tongue, would make no such impression, or excite any such scruples, if expressed in Spanish to one perfectly acquainted with that language. This will be sufficiently intelligible to those who remember that even in ordinary conversation Spaniards make use of expressions which, although perfectly sincere in the feeling which they imply, seem hyperbolical and even absurd to those used to a less gorgeous dialect. Suffice it to mention, as an instance, that a Spaniard will rarely conclude a letter without some such expression as "May you live a thousand years." He knows very well

that his prayer will not be granted; so that what he means by it is nothing more than what we mean by "May you enjoy long life." It is easy to understand that when the language of hyperbole is applied to man, as agreeable and expressive of good will, still more readily will it be applied to the Deity. If the proper allowance be made for this difference, it will be agreed that Lope de Vega has not transgressed more than many other poets in this respect. We have taken the pains to examine his *Rimas Sacras* very carefully; in doing so we have found many passages, which, if translated literally, would seem nothing better than downright burlesque of what is held most sacred by the author's countrymen. But whenever the peculiar idioms of the Spanish do not interfere to shock our Anglo-Saxon ideas of propriety, there are few poets of any country who impress us more strongly on sacred subjects than Lope de Vega. Thus, for example, how many poets have left us a more appropriate address to the Deity than the following?

"I must lie down and slumber in the dust,
And if to-morrow thou should'st call me, Lord,
Perhaps it were too late—perhaps thy word
Might find no entrance in the ear of death.
O, Sovereign Power, and merciful as just,
The influence of thy present grace afford:
Visit me now, for what am I but breath,
Dust, ashes, smoke that vanisheth away!
Full well I know that at the judgment day
I shall again put on these bones of mine;
These eyes shall see my Saviour and my God.
O sure and only joy! O thought divine,
To comfort and sustain me on the road
That leads to poor Mortality's abode."*

Throughout his religious *Comedias* and *Rimas* there are passages of elevated devotion—passages the conceptions of which are as chaste, and as well expressed, as those found in any similar works. Thus, for instance, what poet has infused more pious truth into four lines than the following contain?

---

*Yo dormire en el polvo, y si manana
Me buscares, Senor, sera possible
No hallar en el estado convenible
Para tu forma la materia humana.
Imprime agera, O Fuerza soberana,
Tus efetos en mi, que es impossible
Conservarse mi ser incorruptible,
Viento, humo, polvo, y esperanza vana.
Bien se que he de vestirme el postrer dia
Otra vez estos huessos, y que verte
Mis ojos tienen, y esta carne mia.
Esta esperanza vive en mi tan fuerte,
Que con ella, no mas tengo alegria
En las tristes memorias de la muerte.

"My mother bore me mortal; the free sky
Gave me its common boon of light and air,
And the first breath I uttered was a cry.
Kings are as helpless at their birth as I."*

In short, no intelligent reader who undertakes to examine the works of De Vega will refuse to assign him a high rank among modern authors, especially among dramatists. He does not, indeed, belong to the first class; but in the second he has no superior. If originality, or dependence exclusively on the resources of one's own mind, fecundity of invention, and facility of versification could be regarded as the true test of poetic merit, no one would occupy a higher rank than the author of the twenty-six volumes above alluded to. But certain other qualities are required in which he has been surpassed by several others. At the same time, we are bound to remember that to this day he is without a rival in his own country, among those who understand him best. Cervantes is held to be more happy in his Don Quixote than Lope has been in any one work; a similar remark applies both to Calderon and Quevedo; but it is the opinion of the Spanish critics, that no one author of any age has afforded his countrymen such an immense variety of pleasure and instruction as Lope. This has been the estimate of all classes at all times. During his life, young and old, male and female, rich and poor, regarded him as a prodigy of nature, and actually followed him in the streets to wonder at him. Those desiring to convey the highest idea of the excellence of anything they saw or possessed, applied to it the epithet Lope, as "a Lope hat," "a Lope watch," &c., &c. When he died in 1635, in the seventy-third year of his age, his remains were exposed in state for nine days, so that all classes might have an opportunity to give expression to their veneration and respect for one who had so largely contributed to their happiness. Three bishops officiated at his funeral, the proudest and greatest of the Spanish nobility, with the Duke de Sessa at their head, acted as chief mourners; and the people followed the cortege in hundreds of thousands. We have already spoken of his daughter Marcela, whose only request, after fourteen years of uninterrupted convent life, was that she might be permitted to see his face before the grave closed upon it.

---

* "Hombre mortal mis padres me engendraron,
Ayre comun y luz los cielos dieron,
Y mi primera voz lagrimas fueron,
Que assi los Reyes en el mundo entraron."

The thoughtless and idle may sneer as they will at Lope de Vega; but it is not the less true that it required genius of a high order to maintain himself for more than half a century as the intellectual idol of his countrymen, while their greatest authors were his contemporaries and rivals.

ART. V.—*Acts of Congress and other Public Documents.* 1861–1864.

THE state of our currency, the action of Congress, and much that we meet with in leading journals, forbid us to take for granted a general recognition, even by educated men, of the principles which govern exchange, and its chief instrument, money. Our practice, and our opinions, publicly and privately expressed, evince but little confidence in the wisdom and authority of the conclusions of political economy. The correctness which belongs to them seems to be regarded as one of theory—of interior, logical connections, rather than of practice, of daily guidance and government in the exigencies of national life. Thus we go on to repeat mistakes many times made,—mistakes in the light of which these principles, opening the way to safer action, arose. The best results of patient, scientific thought go for nothing, and we blunder along the old empirical road, surprised by results we ought to have anticipated, and looking for remedies, not to the laws we have neglected, but to some new stroke of cunning evasion. We regard political economy much as we regard ethics. We presume a knowledge of its principles with no thorough study of them; we think them much modified by the exigencies of the moment, as we annul them at the last instant by a want of faith in their actual, their governing authority. A science so used can only render conspicuous and unexcusable the failures it has not been permitted to prevent.

The most immediate, pressing question of economy is that of currency. The well-being of individuals, the just rewards of labor, the security of business, the prosperity and integrity of the nation, are largely dependent on it.

To understand the requisites of a good currency, we must distinctly see the offices it discharges. We shall speak of it chiefly as a medium of just exchange between individuals.

Much the greater part of labor is expended, not in reference to the direct immediate consumption of the products secured, but for the purchasing-power which these confer. Purchasing-power, commanding a wide range of gratifications, is the great aim of industrial pursuits, and this we wish to possess in its most free, full, and serviceable form, to bear it easily and securely with us everywhere, in amounts wholly optional and perfectly divisible. A sound, well-devised currency enables us to reach this most desirable object. We abstract from every object its purchasing-power, condense it in money, and now find it completely pliant, and everywhere available. The product of our labor may be cumbersome, bound down to a single place; by a simple sale its purchasing-power is separated, drops its material load, and, with easy transfer, has the command of all places; it may be perishable, serviceable for an hour, it now becomes as endurable as the most endurable of metals; it may be indivisible, it is now ready to fall at option with all amounts; as an unexchanged product, it may command but a single market or a single sale; as money, it ranges through all markets, and searches out all persons. We have thus abstracted from our labor, in a permanent and perfect form, the only quality we sought, its purchasing-power.

That currency may discharge its offices well, that values may be correctly transferred to it and securely repose in it, it must evidently itself be of unchangeable value. A currency deficient in this respect will be unable to preserve the purchasing-power entrusted to it. Labor secures a certain value in products; wishing to retain this in a safe and available form, it transfers it to money. But this, itself of unstable value, begins at once, like a leaky vessel, to waste what has been committed to it, reducing the returns of labor to its own accidental and depreciated state. Thus value, deposited in a poor currency, becomes less safe than when left to rest in almost any article the product of labor. This operates very unfavorably on incomes arising from interest, the earnings of money. These depreciate often rapidly, to the great and unreasonable loss of those dependent on them. We say rapidly, for the moment the foundations of currency become insecure, the same motives which operated to induce the evil usually push it quickly towards a final catastrophe. If this result follows from legislation, from a currency made to rest on law rather than on intrinsic value, it involves obvious dishonesty towards those who have

entrusted their resources to it, under the virtual pledge of its stability.

The parties on whom these losses fall are, of necessity, those least prepared to endure them. Widows, minors, persons retired from active life, institutions of learning and charity, benevolent organizations, find their supplies cut short, without redress for the past, and often with no escape for the future. The currency has lost its retentive powers, and all who strive to treasure the results of labor in it, do so at their peril. A single year may see their income reduced by half, or made a mere fraction of its former self. However unproductive one's property may be, he may thus be compelled to retain it, rather than to meet the depreciation following a sale. A great office of money fails to be discharged, and those whose incomes are already involved in it suffer severe, unnecessary, and unjust loss.

An unstable currency is unable to discharge another important function, that of correctly measuring value. This, with its loss of retentive power, renders it a constant embarrassment and snare to business. A great office of money is this of measuring value—an office which, in its best form, it discharges not with absolute, but with proximate and sufficient correctness. No article retains perfectly, in all places and times, the same purchasing-power; most vacillate greatly in this respect. They thereby lose the ability of measuring the purchasing-power of other commodities, since their own power is not a stable unit. If my foot-rule varies in length every time I apply it, I cannot thereby effect a comparison between different lengths. For reasons we cannot pause to render, gold and silver are among the most stable of products, and are, therefore, especially fitted to measure values, and become the medium of their just transfer. Grains, fruits, cotton, wool, all the produce of agriculture, and products of manufacture, are varying in different directions and degrees from day to day and month to month, under the diverse circumstances of production and states of the market; but this fact, in a sound currency, is correctly registered in the price, and they still exchange for each other with sufficient justice. It is a simple process of comparative accuracy, to express the purchasing-power of any product in price, and thus put it on the scale of measurement with all other products.

If, however, the price itself has no stable value, the whole work of settling the standard of correct exchange is immediately undone. Some products, lively and sensitive,

quickly feel this double law of change imposed upon them by their own variable value and that of the currency, and register the fact, day by day, in altered prices; more products are sluggish to feel the forces about them. Like a poor thermometer, they long remain at the old mark though the temperature has greatly changed. The exchange of these commodities thus diversely affected must go on, one for the other, with no correct standard of value, and no justice in the results. The one party must suffer unreasonable loss, and the other secure as unreasonable gains. We cannot look in any direction without seeing illustrations of this statement. The profits of some branches of manufacture, as of woollen goods, are very large, since the price of cloths has risen more rapidly than that of wool. The one, in more open and lively market, has felt at once and to the full extent the advance of prices; while the other, lingering behind, has left a large balance in favor of the manufacturer.

The wages of some classes of laborers, aided by an increased demand, has nearly kept pace with the enhanced prices, while those of other classes have experienced no, or very inadequate change. Salaries have rarely so advanced as to meet the exigency. Business is everywhere disturbed by a sudden shock, and called on for an immediate readjustment of prices. Many cannot at once raise the price of their products, and suffer corresponding loss, while others, more fortunately situated, reap extravagant rewards.

Again, those engaged in branches of business which interpose considerable time between the purchase of the raw material and the sale of the completed product, make unusual profits. They buy at lower and sell at higher prices, and therefore find a constant balance in their favor. On the other hand, contractors, whose sales run as it were before their purchases, who agree to erect a building, construct a bridge or a ship for a given sum, find themselves unable to meet their obligations without great losses. These relations will be reversed, and business deranged in an opposite form, when prices shall begin to decline, returning to a specie basis.

The period of advancing prices is one of apparent, but not of substantial prosperity. Many, and these often in the more demonstrative branches of business, are making money rapidly, and give to manufacture and commerce a coloring of success. The losses corresponding to these gains are obscurely divided up among a large class of consumers, from whom the result is in part concealed by the enhanced price

of their own products. Many laborers and producers are receiving unusual sums for their services and products, and thus present the appearance of a prosperity that is not real, and which vanishes the moment they undertake to purchase their customary comforts and enjoyments. There have been strong motives to economy, and a close consumption of articles already possessed. In this way, many have met the exigency for a time, though with a steady loss of power in the country. There has been no corresponding increase of purchasing-power of goods to be purchased, to meet this waste of consumption through the economy of the middle and lower classes.

Business is further and most seriously deranged by the fact, that, in the fluctuating state of prices, opportunity is everywhere furnished for speculation—the making of money by simple purchase and sale, with no modifications or transfers in place of the article. Such transactions serve no economic purpose, are not made in the interests of productions, and very much interfere with them. A restless, feverish feeling is begotten, quite akin to that of the gambler, and the whole field of exchange becomes one of cunning and roguery, instead of industry and patience. The loss and discouragement thus falling on productive interests are not readily calculable. Money slips into the hands of men originally worthless, or made comparatively so by the fortuitous manner of its acquisition.

Purchases are further quickened and made unnatural by an unwillingness to accumulate value in a currency which does not retain it. In and out becomes the law of business, each striving to hit the lucky moment of sale and purchase, knowing that the devil is sure to take the hindmost. Wealth is rapidly achieved, and while prices are advancing, Fortune seems always to favor—though the gifts of her right hand are for the most the plunderings of her left—the petty pilferings of individual good, or a forestalling of future prosperity. In these fluctuations of currency, all the wheels of commerce are loosened, and play with random, or rapid, or disastrous motion, giving the appearance of activity with inadequate and unsafe service. Evils disguised at the outset are found inevitable when discovered.

These derangements of production are as real and as surely attended with loss while the fever of profit and speculation prevails, as when, prices declining, failure and clamor fill the commercial world. The real efficiency and prosperity of

production are too much judged by the gains and losses c the few, her more open and noisy agents. The tendency c the present state of things is to rapidly concentrate wealth accumulate it in the hands of favored parties; not to dispens even and secure fortune to all. Herein the way is prepare for future difficulties. Let prices decline and some will b caught under the reversed wheel of fortune, while other unwilling to carry on a losing business, will withdraw thei wealth, and leave the masses to weather the storm, unsu tained by capital.

The loss of power in a vacillating currency is also see in its inability to secure the very object which led to its de preciation, the gains of government. The greenbacks issue by the general government virtually constitute a loan c three hundred millions, without interest. But how trifling is this profit when compared with the losses which now ac crue from the enhanced prices of the commodities daily re quired in the national service. The cost of equipping an maintaining an army has risen more than one hundred pe cent., through the inflation of the currency; and this is to b endured as the extravagant compensation for a gratuitou loan. The price of gold, though often fluctuating throug secondary causes, marks essentially the depreciation of paper currency, and the consequently accumulated expendi ture with which the nation is called to struggle. The co- of the war is not, indeed, to the full extent of one hundre and fifty per cent. greater than it would otherwise be, yet is very largely and unreasonably enhanced. So far as th revenues of government are paid in gold and silver, no lo accrues, but the interest of loans payable in the same meta almost cancels this advantage. Taxation thus assumes large proportions than would be otherwise needful, giving rise t complaint; the salaries of officers and employés of gover ment are less adequate, and the pay and bounties of soldie less efficient in securing recruits. A momentary advantag has thus been suffered indefinitely to increase the difficult of future operations, and to threaten their entire suspension

There is no greater necessity of government in a crisis lik the present than unshaken confidence, unimpaired credi But what could more certainly forfeit this than a rapid depr ciation of the currency, with no power to arrest it or pr dict its extent? If government is to borrow on a grand sca for a long period, it must do its utmost to keep its paper, all its forms, good.

Nor was there any real necessity for the result. Till the outbreak of the rebellion government had neglected to occupy the field of currency. It remained, therefore, open to its hand an unreaped harvest, ready to render to the nation all the gains which can arise under a sound currency. That these had been surrendered to other parties for a series of years was no reason why they should not now be resumed, when the public exigency so obviously required it. No moral or prescriptive right had been acquired to them by these parties; a first gift does not constitute a claim to a second. Capital would be compelled, in but a very limited degree, to seek new investments, and these it could readily find—government itself opening a wide door.

Government should have had courage to claim its own, and the whole of it. It ought not to have been willing to wreck the currency, and to destroy its own gains by dividing profits with the banks. It should have driven their circulations from the field, as fast as it occupied it with its own bills. Double occupation could result in nothing but mischief. It was a timid and foolish policy, which could secure nothing, and had a right to expect nothing but extended and increasing disaster.

When "greenbacks" were made a legal tender, not themselves redeemable, they relieved banks finally from the restraint of redemption. This curb thus permanently removed, both parties, private and public, stood ready to gorge the currency as fast as its decreasing value should open the way for an enlarged volume. In this race for profits, the first party, as most diffused, as least observed, least scrupulous, and least restrained, of course secures the largest share, while the public good is sacrificed by both. The banks are issuing more unredeemable bills than are sufficient to constitute the nation's currency, and the national issue flows into a swollen stream only further to choke the channels of commerce, and endanger its operations. Our national issue being nearly or quite sufficient for all the demands of business, our monetary embarrassments are referable to the claims of the banks, still urged and admitted, to weigh down the public with a second superfluous, irresponsible currency, destroying the efficiency and value of the first. The remedy is obvious, the moment we have courage to apply it.

We will not say that no currency can, but that no currency will, long preserve its stability without redemption. Discount paper and specie, and all is artificial, uncertain, un-

safe, resting on the wit and will of man and not on the forces of nature. If the issue of the banks had been restricted preparatory to a national currency, there would have been little temptation to make this unredeemable. It is only over-issue that makes redemption difficult, and where there is no inducement to the one, there is no hardship in the other. The very fact, that the banks found themselves unable to meet this test of a safe currency, was an additional reason for taking from them this function of issue. The way was open for a sound redeemable national currency, and nothing but timidity in the presence of a strong moneyed interest withheld us from this great success. Nor is the path of retreat cut off. Force from circulation all bank paper, and government will soon find itself able to redeem its own.

With a given, stable, purchasing power, expressed in the standard unit of a currency, every condition of trade requires a certain amount of this medium with which to effect its transfers, and no more. Pass beyond this amount, and the superfluous sum, in its search for employment, will correspondingly depreciate the value of the whole. The amount of actual value in the currency will, under the same circumstances, be essentially the same, whether the paper issued rise above or sink below the purchasing-power of its standard unit of gold. A given amount of value is required in effecting the exchanges; only so much can be used, and, if bills are multiplied beyond this value, they will at the same time depreciate to it.

Nor is the process by which this is reached in the least recondite. Suppose a redeemable paper currency: redemption is suspended, and the banks are left at liberty to increase at will their issues. This it is their interest to do. Borrowers find easy accommodation. Business receives an impulse; speculators begin to purchase and rely on the banks for aid. Prices rise in the commodities selected; sales follow with profit, and the spirit of liberal and speculative outlay becomes general. Money is readily obtained by all, and there is, therefore, nothing to check the rise of prices. A rise at one point calls forth and justifies a similar rise at another. Enhanced nominal prices drink up the new issues and make way for more. All are able to meet their bank indebtedness, since their own returns are correspondingly great. Thus there is a delusive appearance of prosperity, and the depreciation of the currency goes on with all the losses marked in the earlier part of this article.

These truths are so obvious, we should not have urged them at so much length, were it not for the importance of the conclusions that flow from them, and the frequency with which they are overlooked.

The chief reason—the reason which gives play to all others, and without which the fluctuation to which they give rise would be trifling—is the great excess of our mixed currency, national and private, over the real elements of business. We must settle satisfactorily the reason why legal-tender notes are not at par with gold, or we cannot apply the remedy. If success is all that is wanted to reduce the premium on gold, let us fight the harder; we have no case against the banks. If, however, success alone, without a decided reduction in the amount of circulation, can never restore the currency, then our demand holds good, that that portion of it, about one-half or three-fifths, not supplied by the nation, should be removed, leaving the remainder no such relation to the wants of business, as to raise it to par, and make redemption easy.

That the depreciation of "greenbacks" is not chiefly, or in any very important degree, due to the want of trust in the stability of our government, is seen in the fact, that currency would be less affected by this cause than would loans; yet these are secured with comparative readiness, while other investments, as in real estate, still remain open at prices but slightly in advance of those prevalent before the rise of gold. Those who do distrust the government, and are opposed to it, constantly lodge the funds gathered in speculation in such and kindred investments; but loyal citizens still loan the government with the opportunity before them. The difficulty with which loans are secured, we claim, measures the element of distrust, and marks it as much less than a hundred and forty per cent., the present premium of gold.

The currency is evidently less affected by the mere element of trust than are loans, since these are permanently held in large amounts, while "greenbacks" are in constant transition, neither accumulating in large sums, nor long remaining in the hands of individuals. That, indeed, must be intense distrust which would not allow one to pass the certificates of currency in the rapid traffic of the day. Loans evince plainly that there is no such distrust.

Nor has the vacillation of gold at all kept pace with the prospects of the war. We have just closed a great election; the policy of the government is certainly as hopeful

as it ever has been. A majority, at least, of the peopl so regard it; but gold is at a premium of a hundred an forty per cent. We believe that the excess of the cur rency carries it to nearly this figure, and that the fluctua tions above and below it are due to transient causes, th events of the war, and the heat of speculation.

Gold has steadily advanced through minor fluctuations sinc the breaking out of the rebellion, as the inflated currency ha had time to develop its natural results. The entire history o paper money in France, in England, in our own Revolution and in the present struggle, shows, as plainly as any one fac can be shown, that an unredeemable currency will becom excessive in amount, and that excess will be followed by pro portionate depreciation. The first, the pressing remedy fo the evil, making way for every other remedy, is reduction Most fortunate are we that this can be accomplished b us with no embarrassment of the government, its paper re maining in full circulation.

If all the commercial world were to accept gold and silve as the exclusive medium of exchange, though the measur might involve much inconvenience and considerable expens these metals would at once, so to speak, develop value-powe enough to accomplish perfectly all these exchanges. Gol might be thrown back in value by such an increased deman one hundred or two hundred years, but it would at once ris to a point that would enable it to accomplish the entire dut laid upon it. Gold does not come to the tasks assigned i with a settled, unchangeable value; but the very tasks them selves, by the demand they create, impart to gold a valu enabling it to meet them. Currency does not require s much bulk, but so much value, and this it can create in a ver limited bulk, by its own *fiat*. Famine creates famine price and gold, unlike grain, with each rise of price, performs wider duty.

The very fact that prices are now a hundred per cen in advance of what they were two years ago, shows a gre inflation of currency. To meet the larger nominal sums no employed in exchange, a much greater amount of currenc is required, and the old currency would have failed to do i without a great rise in value, our increased business coul not be carried on at the present scale of prices without per haps thrice the amount of the old currency. Yet, in th order of cause and effect, the increased prices have sprung fro the increased circulation, and not the circulation from th

prices. It is one of the mischiefs of such a movement, that every step prepares for another, and seems to demand it, that apparent prosperity and pressure of exchange seek an increased medium. If, however, we wish to reduce prices, we must reverse the action of the cause, and effect them through the circulation.

Nor need this be done with any harshness or injustice towards the banks. It is not unjust to them to withdraw benefits they have long been permitted to enjoy; nor is it harsh if the method employed be such as to inflict no unnecessary losses, or to force a precipitate transfer of capital. A public exigency of great immediate moment and of lasting results, may rightly require some sacrifice of interest, some change of investments on the part of those who are so unfortunate as to stand in the way of the public good. A tax on the issue of banks, sufficient to absorb its profits, yet not sufficient to compel an immediate and disastrous abandonment of the field, would lie at once in the line of revenue, and reach with due rapidity the more important end of opening to government the entire department of currency. It would then be at liberty, with complete control, to suit the amount and character of its issues to the wants of the nation. In other words, the nation would put a great national interest before private profits, and set itself to the most weighty of duties, that of providing a convenient, safe, staple currency.

The right to do this our government has reaffirmed in the action already taken. The constitutional question has been practically settled, and it becomes, therefore, not merely a duty, but an acknowledged and accepted duty, to complete the work undertaken, to sweep away all that is opposed to a good currency, and to establish all that it requires. Nothing can now excuse us from this labor, nor shall we really find any apology for any ignorance of its nature with so much in history and science to instruct us.

The firmness with which the opposition arising from private interest will be met, will be proportioned to our sense of the necessity of our action, and our certainty of the good results to flow from it. Were it not for the partial truths, the unsound and wavering opinions held by many on this subject, we should doubtless proceed at once cheerfully and thoroughly to the completion of our work in the entire control and reconstruction of the currency. Some points require to be dwelt on, not as abstruse in themselves,

but as imperfectly presented to the public mind, as overlooked or inadequately treated by high authorities.

Bank-notes, and all evidences of debt designed for circulation in a currency, perform a very distinct office from other certificates of debt, and are subject to peculiar laws. Promissory notes, types of the ordinary form of expressing indebtedness, are not primarily designed to pass from hand to hand They may rest with the first holder, or any holder, and perform for him an important service, without even the anticipation of further circulation. They may, indeed, be transferred in the adjustment of balances, and thus, in a very limited degree, take the place of currency, yet without coming under its peculiar laws. Circulation, on the other hand, is the primary end of a bank-bill. It is no mere record of indebtedness, resting with profit in the hands of him who holds it, and valuable according to the credit attaching to the promises of the bank. It is meant to express, retain, and convey a universal purchasing-power, and to be employed constantly in its transfer. It must, therefore, go into the market, or rather be constantly there, to perform its duties. If promissory notes were forced into a constant and general sale, it would be found that other considerations besides their capability of ultimate collection would come in to regulate their value. How many of these are in the market? how readily are they received every where? how quickly and easily can they be cashed?—would be enquiries quite to the point in settling their worth.

No note can be more reliable, or, so to speak, have more credit in them, than products possessed of permanent intrinsic value; yet these, as wheat, wool, iron, and even gold itself, are powerfully influenced, when actually in market seeking a sale, by demand and supply. We know how unfavorably it acts on the price of all commodities to be thrown without reserve upon the market. We might as well say that the exchange-value of a product is determined wholly by the product of the labor it contains, or rather expresses, without reference to the existing supply and demand, as to say that the value of paper money rests exclusively on credit, leaving out of consideration the amount of it in circulation. It will hardly be held that paper money is superior in stability to gold itself, yet by this supposition it ought to be, as the precious metals have steadily lost value from century to century as their amount has increased.

Let us remember that bank-notes must go to the market,

and there be sold and resold like any article containing value, though far more frequently, thus becoming in the very best degree subject to the law of supply and demand. Even when redeemable in gold and silver, they do not altogether escape this law, much less then, when unredeemable, capable of easy and indefinite multiplication.

During the war with Napoleon, the Bank of England suspended specie payment. There followed a depreciation of its bills, passing at times as low as thirty per cent. This thirty per cent. was due not to a loss of credit, not to a feeling among Englishmen that the nation was shaken, and its permanent institutions liable to crumble, but to the multiplication of the certificates of debt beyond the demands of the currency. The public was assured that the general concerns of the bank were in the most affluent and flourishing situation, and such as to preclude every doubt as to the security of its notes. For a little time the notes at the bank remained at par, but the restraint of redemption being removed, the issue gradually increased, and the inevitable depreciation followed. The chief feature of the law passed July 19, 1844, "was to limit the circulation, so that it would be regulated by the amount of coin and bullion in the vaults of the institution." This law sprang from a clear recognition of the fact, that a currency cannot be stable with restraint on issues—that amount is an essential feature in a firm, safe system.

A nation may go triumphantly through a struggle, yet its paper currency at its close be left wholly worthless. It may even retain the power of loan, and therein the general element of credit, and yet the accumulated drift of its excessive issues remain as dead and hopeless as ever. Indeed, when a currency has become very much swollen, redemption seems at once hopeless and unjust. The government in issuing the paper has purchased with it, in produce, perhaps a tenth or twentieth of its nominal value, and, therefore, in fact incurred but a fraction of the nominal debt. Nor can such a currency *as a currency* be restored in value, however much trust may be reposed in the future ability and honesty of the state; such bills will partially recover their worth by being treated simply as promissory notes, withdrawn from circulation, and retained for future redemption.

All have united in admitting and admiring the convenience of paper money; also its economy, so far as by wise

regulation it is made to subserve safely its purpose.] slight failure in office will quickly compensate for its cl ness. Paper must stand redeemable in gold and sil only thus can its amount be perfectly regulated; only can it be made to fill completely and safely the var channels of business; only thus can it have true repres tive powers, and exhibit all the pliancy and ductility of a medium possessed of intrinsic value; and thus alone it be placed in connection with the currency of the w commercial world, be prepared to feel and communicat condition of foreign exchange, and open the way for action of those natural forces which tend to restrict o large foreign trade according to the exigency. Each of t points demands for their full apprehension, an expansio cannot now give them; but, fully understood, they re most evident the necessity of a broad metallic base for efficient, firm medium of exchange.

ART. VI.—1. *Life and Pontificate of Leo X.* By WM. Ro London, 1853.

2. *Literature of the South of Europe.* By SISMONDI. Lo 1853.

3. *History of Italy.* By GUICCIARDINI. London, 1755.

4. *Historical Dictionary.* By BAYLE. Edition of 1736.

THE illustrious family of Medici was founded at Flor in the fifteenth century, by Cosmo dé Medici, the grandf of Lorenzo, who was the father of Leo X. Cosmo was of the merchant-princes of Italy; his immense wealth acquired by commercial speculations, and the banking-h which he established in all the trading cities of Eu Never were riches so honorably gained—never so nobly s The encouragement which this princely merchant afford men of learning, and his munificence in rewarding thei bors, contributed to rescue from obscurity and save fro struction many of the writings of the ancients. "Cosm Medici," says Gibbon, "was the father of a line of pr whose name and age are almost synonymous with the r ration of learning; his credit was ennobled into fame riches were dedicated to the service of mankind; he c sponded at once with Cairo and London, and a cargo o

dian spices and Greek books was often imported in the same vessel."* After governing Florence with great splendor for thirty years, Cosmo died, universally lamented, and his grateful countrymen inscribed on his tomb the well-deserved title of "Father of his Country."

Lorenzo dé Medici, surnamed the Magnificent, was placed, at the early age of twenty-one, by the death of his father, Piero dé Medici, at the head of the government of Florence. Macaulay, in his article on Machiavelli, describes, in a few eloquent passages, the state of Italy at this period: "The admiration," he says, "of learning and genius became almost idolatry among the people of Italy. Kings and republics, cardinals and doges, vied with each other in honoring and flattering Petrarch. . . Knowledge and prosperity continued to advance together. Both attained their meridian in the age of Lorenzo the Magnificent. . . From the oppressions of illiterate masters, and the sufferings of a brutalized peasantry, it is delightful to turn to the opulent and enlightened states of Italy, to the vast and magnificent cities, the ports, the arsenals, the villas, the museums, the libraries. . . With peculiar pleasure every cultivated mind must repose on the fair, the happy, the glorious Florence,—on the halls which rang with the mirth of Pulci; the cell where twinkled the midnight lamp of Politian; the statues on which the young eye of Michael Angelo glared with the frenzy of a kindred inspiration; the gardens in which Lorenzo meditated some sparkling song for the May-day dance of the Etrurian virgins.†"

For a whole century after the death of Petrarch, no poet, worthy of the name, had been known in Italy. But, during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, Lorenzo dé Medici successfully used his influence, his power, and his genius, in restoring the Italian poetry to its pristine splendor. He was himself a poet and a patron of poets, a scholar and a friend of scholars. Under his wise and liberal government Florence became the garden of Italy, the happy seat of the arts and sciences, the academy of literature, the school of philosophy, the blooming bower of taste and refinement. It was his delight to retire from the fatigues of public business to a beautiful retreat in the vicinity of the city, where, in the congenial society of poets, philosophers, and painters, whom his

* Decline and Fall, vol. vi., p. 338. 1850.
† Essays, ed. 1861, p. 28-9.

enlightened generosity had attracted, he passed the time i literary conversation, serene contemplation, and refined r creation.

Leo X., the second son of Lorenzo dé Medici, was born Florence, in the year 1475. Destined from his infancy for th church, he was educated with great care by the celebrate Politian, assisted by the ablest scholars of that age. Th remarkable proficiency which he made in his studies, and th gravity of his deportment, entitled him at an early age mingle as an equal in those meetings of men of genius an learning which frequently took place in the palace of th Medici. Associating so freely with these distinguished me and residing under the eye of his father, who was considere an infallible judge in everything relating to literature an art, those seeds of knowledge and taste were planted whic afterwards bore such ripe and rich fruit.

At the age of fourteen, he was elevated to the dignit of cardinal, with the understanding that he should not a sume the insignia of his rank, or be admitted as a member the college, for the space of three years. On this occasion h friend and preceptor Politian addressed the following lett to the reigning pope, Innocent VIII.: "This young man is s formed by nature and education, that being inferior to non in genius, he neither yields to his equals in industry, nor h teachers in learning, nor old men in gravity. He is naturall honest; and so strictly educated that he never lets fall a immodest or even light expression. He does not distinguis himself by his action, gesture, or gait, or by anything el that may give an ill impression of him. Though a young ma his judgment is so matured that even the old respect him a father. He sucked in piety and religion even with h nurse's milk, and prepared himself for the sacred office eve from the cradle."*

In the mean time, the young cardinal left Florence an repaired to Pisa, in order to pursue the studies of theolog and ecclesiastical jurisprudence at the famous academy that place, which Lorenzo had lately re-established wit great splendor. Here he remained calmly pursuing his studie under the direction of some of the most accomplished schola of Europe, until the expected day at length arrived which w to admit him among the princes of the Christian churc At the time when the Cardinal dé Medici took his seat in th

* Politiano, Let. V., Book 8.

sacred college, it was filled by several men of conspicuous talents, but of wide diversity of character, some of whom afterwards played an important part in the affairs of Europe. The oldest member of the college was Roderigo Borgia, who afterwards became pope, taking the name of Alexander VI. Another member of the college was Francesco Piccolomini, nephew of Pius II. He was created cardinal by his uncle in the year 1460, when only seventeen years old. The exemplary purity of his life, and his zeal in discharging the duties of his office, caused him to be chosen by his colleagues to repair the evil which Alexander VI. had inflicted on the Christian world; but the short period of twenty-six days, during which he enjoyed the supreme dignity under the name of Pius III., defeated the happy hopes which had been formed on his election. Giuliano della Rovere was another eminent member of the sacred college at this time. His bold, active, and martial spirit seemed to mark him as a man better suited to wield the sword than the crozier. He succeeded Pius III. on the pontifical throne, under the name of Julius II.

Italy had now been for several years the home of happiness and peace, which had introduced into that country an abundance, a luxury, a refinement, almost unexampled in the annals of mankind. Instead of contending for dominion and power, the sovereigns of that delightful region attempted to rival each other in taste, in splendor, and in elegant accomplishments. Their palaces became a kind of polite academy, in which noble ladies and gentlemen found a constant exercise for their intellectual talents; and courage, rank, and beauty did not hesitate to associate with taste, learning, and wit.

Italy was at this time inhabited by the most polished people in Europe. All the polite arts and sciences were cultivated with an ardor and a success elsewhere unknown. Her colleges were the most famous in the world, and filled with the most learned professors which Europe could furnish. Crowds of enthusiastic youths thronged the academic halls,

---

[a] Guicciardini, whom Macaulay calls the Tuscan Thucydides, gives the following just and splendid description of Italy at this period: "Ridotta tutta in somma pace e tranquillità, coltivata non meno né luoghi piu montuosi e piu sterile che nelli pianure e regioni piu fertile nè sotto porta ad altro imperio che de suoi medisimi, non solo era abbondantissima d'abitatori e di rechezze; ma illustrata sommamente dalla magnificenza, di molti principi, dallo splendore di molti nobilissimé e bellissime citta, dalla sedia e mæésta delle religione, fioriva d'udomini præstantissimi nell' amministrazione delle con pubblichi; e d'ingequé molto noboli in tutti le scienze, ed in quolunque arte preclara ed industriosa."—*Guic., lib.* 1.

eager for the acquisition of knowledge. The Greek an Latin languages were assiduously studied, and, in some in stances, written with an elegance and an ease which rivalle the most celebrated productions of the ancients.

The ducal court of Milan was, at this period, the residenc of several distinguished artists and scholars, who were a tracted thither by the liberality of Lodovico Sforza, wh then directed, in the name of his nephew, the government that place. Among the artists, the celebrated Leonardo da Vin occupied the most conspicuous place. He was a prodigy of ve satility—being at once a poet, a painter, a musician, a sculpt an architect, an engineer, a geometrician—in fact, there w no branch of science, art, or literature with which he w not familiar. His enchanting wit, splendid person, and e gant address made him one of the chief ornaments of th court of Milan. His conversation charmed all who ap proached him. Princes and peasants, philosophers an fools, were alike captivated by the variety of his acqui re ments. He possessed rare and opposite faculties of mi d; an extraordinary memory, a rich imagination, a plastic w ill, a persevering industry, a remarkable capacity of inventi on, and an overruling reason holding all these various gifts in perfect control. He was not one of those modest men of merit who hide their light under a bushel. He was co m- pletely convinced of his talents, and did not hesitate to let the world know it. He once wrote a letter to the Duke of Milan, in which he speaks of his abilities as a civil and mi li- tary engineer and architect, adding: "Furthermore, I can execute works in sculpture, marble, bronze, or terra-cotta. In painting, also, I can do what may be done as well as any other, be he who he may."

This great painter had no political preferences; he attached himself with equal facility to the Duke of Mi lan and Francis I. his enemy: he served with the same pl ea- sure the court of Rome, the republic of Florence, an d the princes of Europe. Leonardo's masterpiece is his *Last Supper*, in the refectory of the Dominican conv ent at Milan. The artist has seized the moment when the Divine Redeemer announced to the assembled apostles the astounding intelligence that one of them is about to betray him. With admirable skill he has succeeded in expressi ng the doubts and anxiety experienced by the apostles, and th eir earnest desire to know by which of them their Lord and Master is to be betrayed. In their different faces appear

love, terror, anger, grief, and bewilderment. The head of the Man-God is perhaps the most sublime achievement of Christian art; the ineffable sweetness and majesty of that august face could only have been conceived by a soul often immersed in heavenly contemplation. So completely did this glorious painting engross the attention of the artist, that he sometimes remained from morning until night without tasting food. Francis I. was so much pleased with this splendid work of art that he wished to have it removed to France, but that being impracticable, he invited the artist to visit the French court, where he was received with distinguished favor, and, after residing there for several years, died at last in the arms of his royal patron.

This happy state of tranquillity was not destined to continue, and in a few years this lovely land of poetry and art had to endure all the horrors of ruthless war. On her fair plains the kings of France and Spain contended for the possession of Naples and Milan; the peaceful academies of learning were invaded; the students were dispersed; art languished; literature was in danger of being neglected; the iron age seemed about to be revived in Italy. One of the most prominent characters during this period of Italian history was the famous, or rather infamous, Cæsar Borgia. This extraordinary man was the son of Alexander VI. He was quietly pursuing his studies when his father was elevated to the tiara. He hastened to Rome to congratulate his father upon his new dignity, and was created a cardinal. But the quiet life of a churchman did not satisfy the restless ambition of Cæsar Borgia, and he soon abandoned it for the more active life of a soldier. There was no crime too monstrous, there was no undertaking too bold, for this consummate villain. He was one of the most cultivated men of his age, and affected to patronize men of learning and genius; he was gifted with an eloquence which few could resist; under his soft, silken manners he concealed the cunning of the serpent and the ferocity of the tiger; when unsuccessful in arms he resorted to artifice, of which he was an accomplished master. The darling object of his ambition was to establish a kingdom for himself upon the ruins of the Italian states. Several princes of Italy opposed him. By a masterpiece of dissimulation he succeeded in getting them into his power, and soon after caused them to be put to death. Macaulay * pro-

* Essays, Art. Machiavelli, p. 30. 1861.

nounces Cæsar Borgia the first prince and general of hi age. Trained in an unwarlike profession, he formed a ga lant army out of the dregs of an unwarlike people, and, aft acquiring sovereignty by destroying his enemies, he acquire popularity by destroying his tools. He had begun to em ploy for the most salutary ends the power which he ha obtained by the most atrocious means. He fell at las amidst the mingled curses and regrets of a people of whor his genius had been the wonder and might have been th saviour.

After twenty years of war, a better day dawned upo distracted Italy. On the twenty-first of February, 1513, th martial pontiff, Julius II., died, and on the eleventh day c March the Cardinal dé Medici was chosen to the most augu dignity in Christendom. Upon his elevation, he assume the name of Leo X., a name which has served, for mor than three hundred years, to distinguish the golden age o Italian literature, art, and science. The accession of Leo X was hailed with delight by the whole Christian world; h mild disposition, his liberality, his conciliatory manners, a his known fondness for the polished arts of peace, gave ri to the liveliest hopes that the bloody wars between Christi princes, which had disgusted and scandalized Europe so lon would cease.

The coronation of the new pontiff took place on the nin teenth of March, and on the eleventh of April the splend ceremony of the procession of the pope to take possession the Lateran see was celebrated. The procession on th occasion was one of the most gorgeous spectacles that h been witnessed in Rome since the fall of the first Rom empire. All the nobility then in Rome, with many of t sovereign princes of Italy, and the ambassadors of most the European states, contributed to give dignity and impo ance to the ceremony. Alfonso, Duke of Ferrara, made journey to Rome to be present on this occasion, and had t honor of assisting the pope in mounting his horse. His fo midable adversary, Francesco, Duke of Urbino, bore the ba ner of the church. Giulio dé Medici, cousin of the pop carried the standard of the Knights of Rhodes. But t most striking, and perhaps the most pleasing spectacle the Roman people, was that of the chiefs of the two powe ful families of the Orsini and Colonna, whose enmity had f ages disturbed the repose of Rome, accompanying each oth in token of perpetual reconciliation. The streets throug which the pontiff had to pass were spread with tapestry, a

strewn with flowers; the most beautiful works in painting and sculpture of which the city could boast, or which the ingenuity and talents of the Roman artists could produce, were exultingly displayed.*

Those who had anticipated the happiest results from the peaceful temper of Leo X. were not disappointed. From the lofty position which he occupied, he took a wide and comprehensive survey of the whole extent of Europe; he resolved, as far as it lay in his power, to terminate the disgraceful contests that were maintained by the Christian princes; and to exercise his authority, as head of the Christian church, in promoting the peace and happiness of those committed to his charge. Soon after his election, he addressed a letter to Sigismund, King of Poland, who was then preparing a formidable attack upon Albert, Marquis of Brandenburg, asking him to suspend hostilities until a legate should arrive from Rome, who might endeavor to reconcile their dissensions without their appealing to the sword. After the battle of Novara, which resulted in the defeat of the French, and their expulsion from Italy, Leo X. addressed a letter to Maximilian, Duke of Milan, on his restoration to the throne. In this letter the pope took occasion to admonish the duke not only to return thanks to God for so signal an interposition in his favor, but to show himself worthy of it by his future conduct. "This," says he, "will be most effectually done by your not allowing yourself to be too much elated by your success, and by your avoiding to persecute or destroy those who have been induced to oppose you. Let me therefore most earnestly entreat you, by the affection which I bear you, to deal kindly with them. By this means you will conciliate the minds of those who have been alienated from you, without incurring any diminution of your authority, and I trust you will therefore make a moderate and lenient use of your victory."

Leo X., while he was yet a cardinal, had been a liberal friend and patron of deserving scholars and poets, and they hailed his elevation to the pontificate in strains of adulating verse, of which the following will serve as a specimen:

"——Now comes the happier age, so long foretold,
When the true Pastor guards his favor'd fold;
Soon shall the streams with honeyed sweetness flow,
And Truth and Justice fix their seats below;
Retiring Mars his dreadful anger cease,
And all the world be hush'd in lasting peace."

* Roscoe's Life of Leo X., vol. i., p. 301.

The age of Leo X. is one of the most interesting in European history. Not many years had elapsed since the genius and perseverance of Columbus had discovered the New World; the passage to the East Indies was soon after discovered by the intelligent, enterprising spirit of the Portuguese; a few years after his elevation to the supreme dignity, the whole Christian world was distracted by Luther's Reformation. "It was the peculiar glory of this period to produce the most illustrious monarchs who have at one time appeared in Europe. Leo X., Francis I., Charles V. and Solomon the Magnificent were each of them possessed of talents that might have rendered any age wherein they happened to flourish, conspicuous."*

The encouragement which Leo X. afforded to learning and the magnificent liberality with which he rewarded learned men, attracted the first poets, philosophers, and painters of that golden age to his court, and Rome became a Christian Athens. The pontiff himself was the *arbiter elegantiarum* on all subjects relating to art, science, and literature. He was the great luminary of the age, whose generous light fell equally on all. Under his fostering care were produced many of those masterpieces of poetry and art which have been the admiration and despair of all the succeeding centuries. Zorzi, the Venetian ambassador at the court of Rome, in his report to the Senate says of Leo X.: "E hom da ben e liberal molto" (He is a good man, and very liberal). "E docto in humanitá e jure canonico, et sopra tutto musico excellentissimo" (He is learned in classical literature and the canon law, and above all he is a most excellent musician). Minio, another ambassador, wrote: "E docto, e amandor di docti" (He is learned, and the friend of the learned). Of Leo, we may say with Virgil:

"Rex Anius rex idem hominum Phœbusque sacerdos."

He was at once the king of men and the priest of God. Never, not even in the palmiest days of the Cæsars, not even during the splendid reign of Louis XIV., has the world witnessed such a galaxy of genius as the munificent patronage of Leo X. attracted to the capital of the Christian world. To name them is almost sufficient: The elegant Latin scholars Bembo and Sadolet, the pontifical secretaries; the learned Boroaldas, librarian of the Vatican, who publish-ed

* Prescott's Robertson's Charles V., vol. i., p. 523.

the Annals of Tacitus, which had been recently discovered *in* Westphalia, and purchased by Leo X. for *five hundred golden ducats;* the exquisite Latin poet Vida, the Virgil of his age; the entertaining novel-writer Bandello, the rival of Boccaccio; the noble and accomplished Castiglione; the charming poet Ariosto; the immortal historian Guicciardini; the lively but untruthful historian Paulus Jovius; Lascar, the learned Grecian; the crafty Machiavelli; Bramante, the first architect of St. Peter's; Michael Angelo, the designer of the "wondrous dome;" and Raphael, the prince of painters —these are a few of the most prominent characters of that great age, who stand out, like beacon-lights, as guides to all future times.

In this incomparable band, the illustrious Petro Bembo deservedly occupies a conspicuous place. A contemporary poet speaks of him as one

> "——— Whose honeyed tongue
> Gives in three languages his thoughts to flow;
> O'er whose blest birth the sister graces hung,
> And taught his mind with all their charms to glow."

This eminent scholar was born in Venice in the year 1470. The early part of his life was divided between frivolous amusements and severe study. He was a frequent and a welcome visitor at the ducal courts of Ferrara and Urbino, where he was much admired for his wit and personal accomplishments, and honored for his learning and genius. The celebrated Lucretia Borgia was at this time the reigning duchess of Ferrara. Her extraordinary beauty, her brilliant endowments, and her fascinating affability moved the susceptible heart of Bembo, who had already twice been the slave of disappointed love. A Platonic attachment sprang up between this accomplished pair, which lasted for several years. When Bembo was appointed by Leo X. to the honorable office of pontifical secretary, he fixed his residence at Rome, where he found himself surrounded by the most distinguished literary and artistic characters. His particular friends and associates were the cardinals De Bibbieno and Giulo dé Medici (cousin of Leo X.), the divine artist Raphael, and the accomplished nobleman Castiglione. The Latin writings of Bembo were the production of the early part of his life. The style of these compositions is so extremely elegant and classic, that he was said to have emulated Cicero and Virgil with equal success. But the chief glory of Bembo was the prominent part which he took in cultivating a true taste for Ital-

ian literature, after the revival of classical learning had made the language of Dante and Petrarch vulgar—

> "Whilst rivalling the strains that Mars had sung,
> Thine hands across the Latian chords were flung,
> Love raptured heard; and bade the next aspire
> To awake the sweetness of the Tuscan lyre."

A short time before Leo X. died, Bembo retired from Rome and took up his residence in the city of Padua. Here his time was passed in study, in elegant pleasures, and in the enjoyment of the society of his friends. Here he formed, at great cost, a splendid collection of the ancient manuscripts of the Greek and Roman authors, and a valuable cabinet of ancient coins and medals. Here were written, in the sweetest and purest Tuscan, the greater part of those inimitable literary works, the delight of his own and all succeeding ages. During the sixteenth century, the writings of Bembo were the favorite reading among the first ranks in Italy, and an acquaintance with them was necessary in order to mingle in polished society. Bembo prided himself particularly on his power of language: "*Io so nulla per rispetto à que gloriosi, ma quel poco che io ne so delle linque, non lo cangierce al marchesato di Mantoua*" (I know nothing that I have to glory in; but for the little that I know of language, I would not change it for the marquisate of Mantua). He selected as his models the sweet and tender Petrarch, and the elegant and lively Boccaccio; by combining their excellences with his own perfect taste, he assisted, by his influence and example, in banishing that homely style which characterized the writings of the Italian authors at the commencement of the sixteenth century. In the year 1539, Bembo was called to Rome by Paul III. and elevated to the rank of cardinal. He found in the sacred college many of his former friends, particularly the cardinals Sadolet, Cortese, and the English cardinal Reginald Pole. Bembo died in Rome, in the year 1547, in the seventy-seventh year of his age.

Leo X. possessed that magnificent taste for the fine arts which was a peculiar distinction of the Medici family. His palace, the Vatican, was adorned with the masterpieces of ancient and modern art. Under his favor and liberality, were completed those exquisite paintings in the chambers of that splendid edifice, which have ever since been the theme of universal admiration. The divine Raphael was employed during nine years in the execution of these glorious works which still remain, in all their pristine freshness and beauty, the

imperishable monuments of his genius. The most celebrated of these frescoes are the "School of Athens," the "Scourging of Heliodorus," "Mount Parnassus," and the "Hall of Constantine." The "School of Athens" is a representation of philosophy. In a magnificent amphitheatre, the ancient philosophers are introduced as instructing their disciples in the different departments of human knowledge. Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle are characteristically represented. Diogenes, Archytas, Archimedes, and Empedocles are engaged in their various avocations. Apollo and Minerva are the presiding deities of the scene. A handsome youth in a white and gold mantle is said to be intended for Francesco della Rovere, the great nephew of Julius II.; in the person of Archimedes, the artist took the opportunity of perpetuating the likeness of his friend and relative Bramante, the eminent architect. This painting is composed of fifty-two figures; but such is the skill of the artist that none of them seem to be in each other's way. A judicious critic, in speaking of the "School of Athens" and the "Scourging of Heliodorus," remarks: "These two works of Raphael, had all the rest perished, would have vindicated his claim to the title of the Prince of Painters. It may, indeed, well be doubted, whether he would ever have surpassed these paintings had he lived longer. In the 'Parnassus,' Apollo and the Muses are represented attended by a company of the Greek, Latin, and Italian poets. The father of poetry appears in an attitude of great dignity and grandeur, reciting his immortal compositions. Virgil is seen pointing out to Dante the way he is to follow. Only two living authors, Sanazzaro and Tebaldio, are admitted into these regions of poetical immortality. The artist has partly claimed a place for himself in this glorious assembly. He appears near to Virgil, with his beautiful head crowned with the 'laurel wreath,' and is deservedly admitted into that Parnassus where he drank from his infancy the waters of Hippocrene, and was nursed by the Muses and the Graces."*

At the same time that the inspired pencil of Raphael was engaged in executing these exquisite paintings, the genius of Michael Angelo was producing those sublime frescoes in the Sistine Chapel that have rendered his name immortal. The first of these is the world-renowned "Last Judgment." None but the mighty mind of Michael Angelo could have con-

* Geo. S. Hillard, Six Months in Italy, vol. i., p. 268.

ceived—none but the mighty hand of Michael Angelo coul have executed this tremendous work. The whole lower en of the chapel, over the altar, is occupied by this great fresc covering a space sixty feet high and thirty feet broad. Th rich colors have become somewhat faded by the lapse of tim and obscured by the smoke of wax candles and incense, whic are so much used in the service of the Catholic Church. Th first sight of this sublime masterpiece leaves an overpowe ing impression upon the mind. "I have seen Micha Angelo," said a French artist, "and he is terrible." He indeed terrible in the "Last Judgment," and the power whi he has displayed is almost superhuman. The utter woe, th fearful agony, the dreadful despair depicted in the faces the lost souls, fill the beholder with astonishment and aw No touch of sorrowful sympathy entered the painter's hear All is hard, severe, pitiless. The justice of an offended Gc and the heinousness of sin were the only thoughts that occ pied the mind of Michael Angelo. In the upper part of th painting the saints, patriarchs, martyrs, and other holy sou are ranged on the right and left hand of the Saviour of th world. "Depth and tenderness of feeling, the purity of c lestial love, the serene triumph of faith, the soft calm of i ward peace, do not shed their gentle influences upon t scene. We look in vain for the rapt brows of Angelico, t ideal heads and finely flowing draperies of Raphael, the wo but ecstatic forms of Cigoli, and those cherub-faces of C reggio which beam like embodied smiles." *

If the accounts of his contemporaries be true, and w have no reason to doubt them, Raphael must have been beautiful in his person and life as he was in his genius. H is represented with long, flowing curls, a smiling mouth, a a most heavenly expression in his soft, dark eyes—he was, i deed, as beautiful as one of his own angels. He always to the greatest pleasure in assisting the poor but deserving a tists of his time; he was never known to refuse his servic to any one who asked him; he was entirely devoid of env he rendered the meed of praise to all who deserved it; thanked God that he was born in the time of Michael Ange The numerous pupils who were attracted to the studio Raphael, almost adored their gifted master; and whene he appeared in public, he was attended by a crowd of enthusiastic followers.

* Six Months in Italy, vol. i., p. 259.

The four great painters of this age had each a peculiar and distinct merit. Michael Angelo was distinguished for the learning of his design; Titian for the richness and truth of his coloring; Correggio for the charm of pencilling and *clair-obscura;* Raphael for invention and composition. But if these celebrated painters be compared with one another, it cannot but be admitted that Raphael more nearly approached each of his three rivals in that which constituted the especial merit of each, than each of them equalled Raphael in the points peculiar to him. Perhaps there never were two great artists more opposite in their life and genius than Michael Angelo and Raphael—the one all grandeur and sublimity; the other all sweetness and grace. The masterpieces of Michael Angelo fill the beholder with terror and amazement; the masterpieces of Raphael fill the beholder with purity and love. Michael Angelo is the Milton, and Raphael the Shakespeare of painters. We admire Michael Angelo—we love Raphael. Michael Angelo has left a magnificent monument of his genius in St. Peter's—the princely Christian temple erected by the prince of Christian architects. Raphael died after a pure and beautiful life of thirty-seven years. His death-bed was surrounded by his weeping friends, who were inconsolable for the loss of the divine artist, whom the whole civilized world lamented. He left more than two hundred paintings as imperishable monuments of his genius and industry.

From the revival of letters in the fourteenth century, classical learning had made a rapid and regular progress, and in the course of nearly two hundred years had attained to the highest degree of excellence. The wise and liberal encouragement of Leo X. was destined to give a last impulse to these elegant studies; for if there was one department of literature the professors of which he regarded with a more particular favor, and rewarded with a greater generosity than those of another, it was that of Latin poetry. We have already had occasion to speak of Bembo's proficiency in this pleasing branch of polite learning. His associate in office, Jacopo Sadolet, was hardly less distinguished for the great elegance of his Latin writings. His Latin tracts, and particularly his treatise "De liberis Instituendis," have been justly admired for their superior scholarship; his Latin verses on the group of the Laocoon, which had been discovered in the baths of Titus during the pontificate of Julius II., have been pronounced worthy of the exquisite rem-

nant of ancient art which they are intended to celebrate Sadolet was a distinguished member of those literary associations which were formed at Rome during the reign of Leo X., and which contributed so much to the encouragement of science and letters, and the promotion of good fellowship among the eminent scholars of that golden age. The ability and diligence of Sadolet in his official employment were rewarded by Leo X. with a bishopric, the duties of which he faithfully performed. It was not, however, until the pontificate of Paul III., in the year 1536, that Sadolet was raised to the purple, a dignity, says Roscoe, which he had long merited, not only by the services which he had rendered to the Roman see in many important embassies, but by the temperate firmness of his character, his elegant and conciliating manners, and his sincere and unaffected piety.

One of the brightest literary ornaments of the court of Leo X. was the elegant Latin poet Vida. He was a native of Cremona, a city which has long been celebrated for the beauty and sweetness of its musical instruments; and was born about the year 1480. His family was of respectable rank, and although his parents were not wealthy, they were able to bestow upon him that best of all gifts a good education, for which purpose he was sent successively to several of the academies of learning for which Italy was at that time so justly renowned. After having acquired a considerable proficiency in philosophy theology, and political science, he settled in Rome during the pontificate of Julius II. His principal works, however, were not written until the reign of Leo X. The first of these was his "De Arte Poetica." This poem made the name of Vida known far beyond the limits of his own country, and has obtained the approbation not only of the Italian scholars, but of some of the most correct and elegant poets and critics, of England. Pope, speaking in his "Essay on Criticism,' of "Leo's golden days," has the following beautiful lines:

> "Then sculpture and her sister arts revive;
> Stones leaped to form, and rocks began to live:
> With sweeter notes each rising temple rung;
> A Raphael painted, and a VIDA sung.
> Immortal Vida! on whose honor'd brow
> The poet's bays and critic's ivy grow;
> Cremona now shall ever boast thy name,
> As next in place to Mantua, next in fame!"

Warton, in his "Essay on Pope" (p. 197), considers the "Poetics" of Vida as "one of the first, if not the very first, piece o

criticism that appeared in Italy since the revival of learning."

The "Poetics" were soon followed by his "Sacchiæ Ludus," a poem on the game of chess. Leo X. was an admirer and a skilful proficient in this fascinating and scientific game, and when this poem was shown to him, he was delighted with the novelty of the subject, and with the dignity, ease, and clearness with which it was treated; which seemed to him almost beyond the bound of human powers. He therefore requested to see the author of this pleasing production. Vida was received by the pontiff with flattering kindness and distinction, retained as an attendant on the court, and rewarded with wealth and honors; but what appears to have chiefly pleased the poet was, that his works were read and approved by Leo himself. At his suggestion, Vida began his celebrated poem of the "Christiad," which was afterwards completed in six books, and published under the auspices of Clement VII., in the year 1535. In composing this poem, Vida placed Virgil before him as his principal model; he regarded the great Mantuan bard with sentiments next to adoration, yet he knew how to fix the limits of his imitation; and whilst he studied the style and manner, and sometimes even used the language of Virgil. he avoided the error into which some of his contemporaries had fallen in mingling the profane fables of the heathen mythology with the mysteries of the Christian religion. In order to reward Vida for writing this great poem, Clement VII. raised him to the rank of pontifical secretary, and in the year 1532 conferred on him the bishopric of Alba, where he died in 1566, much respected for his talents, his integrity, and his sincere and fervent piety.

It would be unjust, as well as ungallant, not to mention several learned ladies, who, in the time of Leo X., were distinguished for their accomplishments, their virtues, and their poetical talents. Among these, two are conspicuously eminent: Victoria Colonna, Marchioness of Pescara, and Veronica Gambara, Countess of Correggio. Victoria Colonna was the daughter of the celebrated commander Fabrizio Colonna, Grand Constable of the Kingdom of Naples, by Anna di Montefeltro, the daughter of Federigo, Duke of Arbino. At the early age of four years, Victoria was betrothed to Ferdinando d'Avalos, Marquis of Pescara, who was only a little older than herself. The extraordinary beauty of her person, and the rare and brilliant endowments of her mind, combined to make her the object of general admiration, and before she had attained her seventeenth year, her hand was repeatedly sought in mar-

riage by several of the independent princes of Italy. H
pily, however, these splendid alliances were rejected, and
beautiful and accomplished Victoria Colonna became the
of her parents' early choice, who was, fortunately, the obje
her own devoted love. The Marquis of Pescara, by his brill
talents, his invincible fidelity, and chivalric courage,
merited such a partner. After a few brief years passe
the sweet interchange of mutual affection, the unha
contests which made fair Italy the battle-field of Eur
called the marquis from his domestic delights to
clash and glory of contending armies. At the battle
Ravenna, where he commanded the cavalry, and distinguis
himself by his dashing bravery, he was dangerously wour
and taken prisoner by the French, the victors of that blo
field. While confined in the castle of Milan, and prever
by his wound from bodily exercise, he devoted his tim
study and literary composition, the result of which appe
in a dialogue on Love, which was addressed to his belo
wife. The marquis was at length liberated from cont
ment, and entered again into active service; his skill in n
tary affairs, and the many engagements in which he
victorious, won for him a high rank among the Italian lea
of that age. Having entered into the service of Charles
he commanded at the celebrated battle of Pavia, in wh
Francis I. of France was made prisoner; the success of
Imperialists on that day has generally been attributed to
marquis, who distinguished himself no less by his magnanim
and humanity than by his prudence and intrepidity.* T
was his last and greatest victory, for soon after the battle
fell a sacrifice to his military fatigues, and the consequer
of his wounds. He died at Milan in December, 1525, in
bloom of his bright and beautiful career. His devoted
was rendered inconsolable by this fatal event. The
alleviation which her deep sorrow would admit was foun
celebrating the character and virtues of her husband, an
recording their mutual attachment in touching and exqu
verse. Soon after his death she retired to the island of Is
where her time was passed in works of charity and relig
and in the composition of those beautiful poems which
placed her name among the celebrated writers of that glor
age. Her *Stanze*, or verses in *ottava rima*, are pronou
equal in simplicity, harmony, and elegance of style, t

* Roscoe's Leo X., vol. ii., p. 125.

productions of any of her contemporaries, and in lively description and genuine poetry to have excelled them all, excepting only those of the inimitable Ariosto. The virtues, the accomplishments, and the beauty of Victoria Colonna rendered her the object of universal applause among the poets and learned men of the time, with many of whom she kept up a regular correspondence. She was also a warm admirer and friend of Michael Angelo, who addressed to her several of his sonnets, in which his admiration of her beauty and poetical talents is tempered by the most profound respect for her character. This estimable lady died at Rome in the year 1547, leaving behind her the enviable reputation of being one of the fairest models of female excellence and conjugal affection that the world has ever seen.

Veronica Gambara was the daughter of Count Francisco Gambara, and was married in 1509 to the lord of Correggio. Her disposition, her talents, her education, and the instructions and advice of the elegant and learned Bembo, led her in her youth to devote a part of her leisure moments to the cultivation of poetry. After the early death of her husband, Veronica devoted herself to the education of her two sons, one of whom afterwards was elevated to the dignity of cardinal. The poetical compositions of Veronica Gambara, although inferior in elegance and polish to those of her friend Victoria Colonna, display a striking originality and vivacity both in sentiment and language.

The chief glory of this golden age, so rich in glorious names, was the celebrated and enchanting poet Ariosto. He was the son of a nobleman of Ferrara, but his genius has obtained for him a rank and a fame which kings cannot bestow or kings take away. He was first destined to the legal profession, but after devoting five years to dry and unprofitable labor, he abandoned that pursuit for the flowery fields of poetry, in which he was to reap so rich a harvest. His earliest writings were of a dramatic character; before he was twenty years old, he had produced two comedies, which were the means of recommending him to the notice of Ercole d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, whom he accompanied, in the year 1491, to Milan, to witness the theatrical performances for which that city was then distinguished. From this time Ariosto devoted himself to the service of the family of Este, either in the court of the duke or in that of the cardinal Ippolito d'Este. Ariosto commenced his wild, dreamy, magnificent, sportive poem, "Orlando Furioso," in the year 1505; he was

occupied upon this immortal work for eleven years, amidst the constant distraction of business, for he was a diplomatist and politician, as well as a poet. The "Orlando Furioso" was published at Ferrara, in 1515, and was received with the liveliest enthusiasm throughout Italy. It has been translated into all the modern languages, and has won the unqualified applause of the most eminent scholars and critics of every age, on account of its transparent style, its fine raillery, its incomparable humor, and the sweetness, grace and elegance of its versification. By the sole charm of its romantic adventures, independently of its exquisite poetry, the "Orlando Furioso" has been the delight of the youth of every country. Galileo being asked by what means he had acquired the remarkable facility of giving perspicuity and grace to his philosophical writings, referred it to the continual study of Ariosto. The enchantment of his pencil redeems every failing, and his rapidity, like that of Homer, leaves us little time to censure before we are hurried forward to admire. The "Orlando Furioso," as a great single poem, has been rarely surpassed, and in the living records of poetry the author must yield to three, and only three, of his predecessors. He has not the force, simplicity, and truth of Homer, the exquisite style and sustained imagery of Virgil, nor the originality and boldness of Dante.* Ariosto was the author of several satires, whose inimitable wit and attractive style have merited for him the title of the Horace of his age. The first of these satires was suggested by what appeared to be the ungenerous conduct of the cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who deprived the poet of a small pension of a hundred crowns a year for refusing to accompany him on a visit to Hungary. He found a more liberal patron in the cardinal's brother, Alfonso, Duke of Ferrara, who gave him a lucrative situation at his court, without requiring from him any attendance which would interfere with his studies. Here he passed the remainder of his life, engaged in literary labors, and never ceasing to retouch and polish his immortal poem. He died at Ferrara, in 1533, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.

In enumerating the distinguished men who flourished during the golden age of Leo X., it is expected that some mention should be made of one who acted so conspicuous a part, both in the literary and political world, as Nicholas Machiavelli. This celebrated man was of a noble, but poo

* Hallam's Literature of Europe, vol. i., p. 168.

mily of Florence. His early life was passed in obscurity, d very little is known of him until he had reached the irtieth year of his age, when he was so fortunate as to at- ct the notice of the Medici family, then the most powerful in lorence; by their influence he was appointed secretary of e republic, the affairs of which he conducted with con- picuous ability. From this time he was constantly engaged public affairs, particularly in embassies which required xterity and skill. Machiavelli repaid the kindness of his st patrons by becoming a partisan of the faction which ove the Medici from Florence. When they were re- alled, in 1512, after nearly twenty years of exile, he was prived of his honors and banished the city. He then en- ered into a conspiracy against the Medici, which was discov- ered, and Machiavelli was imprisoned and tortured, without, however, eliciting any confession that would have impeached either himself or his accomplices. When Leo X. was raised to the pontifical throne, he restored Machiavelli to liberty; this did not prevent him from entering into another plot im- mediately after the death of Leo, to expel the cardinal De Medici from Florence. At length, after a life of vicissitudes—one day the honored and influential secretary of the repub- lic, another a disgraced and tortured conspirator—after being the friend and companion of princes, after holding many high and important offices, Machiavelli died in the year 1527, in extreme poverty.

The writings of Machiavelli consist of several comedies, a "History of Florence," his "Discourses upon Livy," and "The Prince." His comedies have won the commenda- tion of one of the most celebrated writers of modern times. Voltaire,* speaking of the state of the polite arts in the six- teenth century, observes, that "Italy had its Thucydides in Guicciardini, who wrote the history of the war of his own time, as Thucydides wrote the wars of Peloponnesus. Their stage, though far short of that degree of perfection to which the French theatre afterwards attained, might be compared to the Greek drama, which they began to revive; Machiavelli's "Mandragols" alone is perhaps preferable to all of Aristophanes' comedies." The maxims which Machiavelli inculcated in his book entitled "The Prince," have caused him to be regarded, for more than three hundred years, as the quintessence of craft, fraud, and dissimulation. No one can

* General History of Europe, vol. ii., part iv., chap. 1.

peruse this infamous work, which was written in the calm retirement of the closet, and intended for the guidance of a young prince, without regarding its author as the master of hypocrisy and the demon of deceit. Everybody has heard of Machiavelli's maxim, "*Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare.*" This famous maxim is considered by some authors as a comment upon that passage in Euripides, which Cicero says Julius Cæsar always had in his mouth:

> "Si violandum est jus, regnandi gratia violandum est,
> In cœteris rebus pietatem colas,"

which has been thus freely rendered:

> Be thou strictly just, except a throne
> Come to thy reach; then Justice, get thee gone!

After reading the following baneful advice, we are not astonished that Cardinal Pole declared that the writings of Machiavelli were traced by the finger of the devil: "It is honorable for a prince to *seem* merciful, courteous, religious, punctual, and sincere, and indeed to be so; but it is necessary, at the same time, that he should have his mind so modelled, and be so much the master of himself, that he may know how to alter his conduct upon occasion; a prince cannot form by practice all those qualities which make men esteemed good and virtuous; he will often be obliged, for the preservation of his state, to violate the laws of charity, humanity, and religion, and therefore he should be ready prepared to shift his sails according to the wind that blows; as I said before, never to do evil if he can help it; but if he is compelled by downright necessity, to make no scruple of it."[o]

Too soon for the Christian world, of which he was the peace-maker; too soon for the Christian church, of which he was the ornament and the head; too soon for beautiful Italy, of which he was the protector; too soon for literature and art, which he wisely and zealously encouraged; too soon for men of genius and learning, whom he generously rewarded—Leo X. died in the year 1521, in the forty-sixth year of his age, and in the ninth year of his reign. In disposition Leo X. was kind and conciliatory; it was always a pleasure to him to be able to confer a benefit, and a pain when he had to refuse a request; his moral character was irreproachable he was chaste, decorous, and temperate in his diet, even be

[o] Machiavelli's Complete Works, London, 1742, vol. i., p. 632.

yond the requirements of the church; he possessed a remarkable memory; his reading was extensive; he spoke and wrote Latin with elegance and ease; he had a considerable knowledge of Greek; he wrote both Italian and Latin verse; he was devoted to music; he had a fine ear, and a melodious voice which had been cultivated with assiduous care; in the august ceremonies of the Catholic Church, he was always distinguished for the splendor of his dress, and the dignity and decorum of his manner. Bayle, in his "Historical Dictionary," article Leo X., says: "Men of letters, of what religion or nation soever, are bound to praise and bless the memory of this pope, for the care he took to recover the manuscripts of the ancients; he spared neither pains nor cost in searching for them and procuring very good editions. Guicciardini, in the first twelve books of his history, represents Leo X. as an accomplished model of modern policy, and the greatest statesman of his age." Rankes, in his "History of the Popes,"* in speaking of Leo X., says: "A liberal kindness, active intellect, a ready persuasion of good in others were among his distinctive characteristics. These qualities are the fairest gifts of nature, and but rarely acquired, but when possessed, how greatly do they enhance all life's enjoyments."

We cannot better conclude this article than in the language of Mr. Roscoe, the elegant biographer of Leo X.

"That an astonishing proficiency in the improvement of the human intellect was made during the pontificate of Leo X. is universally allowed. That such proficiency is principally to be attributed to the exertions of that pontiff will now perhaps be thought equally indisputable. Of the predominating influence of a powerful, an accomplished, or a fortunate individual on the character and manners of the age, the history of mankind furnishes innumerable instances; and happy is it for the world when the pursuits of such individuals, instead of being devoted, through blind ambition, to the subjugation or destruction of the human race, are directed towards those beneficent and generous ends, which, amidst all his avocations, Leo X. appears to have kept continually in view."

ART. VII.—1. *Philosophical Magazine;* Ed. by A. TILLOCH. London, 1798—1822.

2. *London and Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science;* Ed. by SIR D. BREWSTER. Taylor and Phillips: London, 1832–1850.

---

* Vol. i., p. 68, Bohn's edition.

3. *London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science;* Ed. by KANE AND FRANCIS. London, 1851.
4. *Denkschriften der Königlichen Academie der Wissenschaften zu München für die Jahre* 1814, 1815. München: 1817.
5. *Abstracts of the Papers printed in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London.* London: R. and J. E. Taylor.
6. *L'Institut, Journal Universel des Sciences, &c.* Paris.
7. *Annales de Chemie.* Paris.
8. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie.* Von J. G. POGGENDORFF. Leipzig.

OF all natural phenomena, none are more striking than the production of the rainbow. Iris, the divine token of the Greeks and Romans, was especially pointed out to man by the God of the Hebrews: "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth." When, by an artificial production of the rainbow effect, we enable ourselves to understand that the remote orbs, not only of our solar system but of others, are composed of the same elements which combine to constitute our globe, and from thence deduce the existence of him who called our attention to this natural spectrum, we fail not to read this promise again with renewed hope.

AS might be expected, the list of authors who have discussed this phenomenon is very long; they belong to many nations and to almost all ages; but it is to Fletcher, who, in 1571, first announced refraction of the sunlight by the rain to be the cause,* and to De Dominis,† Descartes, and Newton, that we owe theories and experimental investigations, culminating in the true explanation of the effect. It is only necessary here to allude to the labors of Newton, which laid the foundation of this branch of analysis. It is not known positively who first separated a ray of white light into its constituent colored rays, by refracting it with an artificial prism.

In 1666, Newton‡ performed this experiment to amuse himself, using a triangular glass prism; but his amusements turned out to be of more importance to mankind than the most recondite researches, in this direction, of previous

* Priestly on Light and Colors, p. 50.
† De Radiis Visus et Lucis, 1611.
‡ Optics. London, 1718, p. 22.

philosophers. He first drew conclusions worthy of the striking effect produced. He announced that different rays of light have different degrees of refrangibility, and that to the same degree of refrangibility always belongs the same color, and to the same color the same degree of refrangibility. In studying the solar spectrum, he pointed out the advantages of a slit, with its length parallel to the prism, for the beam to pass through, suggesting one an inch or two long and $\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{20}$ of an inch wide, or even narrower, and described the effects of circular or triangular openings.

Pownall* called attention in 1801, to Herschel's statement in 1796, that the colored rays of the sunlight do not proceed from that globe itself, but from inflamed vapors floating on its surface. It occurred to him that similar colored lights arising from flames of bodies burnt in our terrestrial atmosphere should be found to observe the same refractions and be affected by the same laws which operate in the solar light. By direct analogy he supposes the solar light to be emitted from a compound of inflamed vapors, each colored ray therein taking the hue of its respective vapor-flame, and refers to these colored vapors being produced in the sun by the inflammation of the same bodies which can produce them here.

These speculations interest us as being the results of one of the earlier attempts to analyse the sun's constituents. He describes the spectra of the electric spark, iron filings in oxygen, phosphorus in oxygen, camphor dissolved in alcohol, spermaceti in Argand's lamp, wax, and tallow. He uses the spectrum of red-hot iron as his standard. This, viewed through a prism, is found decomposed into a deeply tinged red and a deep bluish green only, the gradations of blue being invisible. His apparatus consisted of a high, long box, black internally, with a sliding door in front, pierced with a half-inch hole. A side door admitted the lights to be examined. The prism was applied to the hole. In studying blue flames, removing the hole, he turned his prism till the beam was refracted on the floor of his darkened room. "This solar light must arise, he says, from vapors having similar bases as these terrestrial colored lights have"—"and must, having the same properties, be of the same nature"—"it is resolved exactly as the terrestrial lights above examined are, into the constituent colored lights which the

* Phil. Mag., vol. xii., p. 42.

several bases give out." He speculates on the mineralogy of the sun, moon, and stars, from facts concerning the various lights they emit.

Wollaston* observes, in 1802, that by looking through a prism at a distant crevice in a window-shutter, the division of the spectrum may be seen much more distinctly than by any other method. In the light of the lower part of a candle, the spectrum is distinguished by dark spaces into five distinct portions. This latter observation is the scaffolding for the first story of the edifice whose foundations Newton laid.

It is to Fraunhofer,† (1815) that we owe our first description of the nature of these dark spaces, though he was ignorant of their cause and importance. In his paper he gives instructions in the art of examining spectra formed with combinations of prisms and viewed through a telescope. He calculated the angles of refraction of the colored rays for prisms of various substances, and described the apparatus used, which consisted essentially of the lights examined with their accompanying slit and prism in one house, and across the street in another house a second prism and telescope. He called attention to the effect of temperature in altering the results: he made a long and very narrow slit in the window-shutter, and near it placed an equiangular flint-glass prism. Twenty-four feet off, with a telescope, he viewed the spectrum from a lamp, and noticed what was afterwards called the line of sodium. He was entirely ignorant of the profound importance this observation was destined to assume. With the same apparatus, observing the solar spectrum, he observed it crossed by very many dark lines of various breadths and shades. He gave a plate of this result, in which we count three hundred and fifty-five lines perpendicular to the length of the spectrum, and it is especially to be noted that he figures the sodium line, before alluded to, as a double line. The most marked lines he calls A, a, B, C, D, (double, afterwards called sodium line), E, b, F, G, H. The intervals vary greatly between these lines themselves, and the natural groups into which they are arranged.

To observe these phenomena in their perfection, the prism must be placed at its angle of minimum deviation. Oil of anise is recommended as the refracting medium. He

* Phil. Mag., vol. xiii., p. 289.

† Denkschrift. der Königlich. Akad. der Wissenschaft. zu München. Band v. 193.

red the angles of refraction of B, C, D, E, F, G, and
hese lines ever afterwards bore the name of Fraun-
fixed lines, and to him credit is undoubtedly due for
shing the second epoch in what was to become the
n spectral chemical analysis. - He studied, with his
tus, beams from Sirius, Venus, and other celestial
, comparing their spectra with the solar, and noticed
ıe spectra of the stars differed one from another.
is not necessary here to give details; they will be given
on when we review the discoveries which extend the
ations, made by modern physicists with perfected ap-
s, in celestial chemistry. He described the spectrum
tric light, which differed from that of the sun and of arti-
ires. Static electricity was passed through a glass
etween two conductors, and a dark line was seen in
ɜen part of the spectrum, one in the orange, one in
l, and four others in the violet portions. This is the
s of some of the most brilliant of modern investiga-
He examined the spectrum of hydrogen and of alcohol,
ıg that the reddish-yellow line of the spectrum of each
e brightest: he fails to recognise it in sulphur. These
nents are very significant to us now.
1822, Herschel* analysed the light from the colored
emitted by various ignited bodies, by means of the prism.
ıcribed the spectra of compounds of strontia, lime, cop-
ıd boron. In 1827,† he also described the spectra
ium, iron, and barium. "Of all salts," he says,
muriates succeed best from their volatility;" "the
thus communicated by the different bases to flame,
in many cases a ready and neat way of detecting ex-
y minute quantities of them."
lbot‡, in 1826, analysed the spectra of various artifi-
ghts. He observed a constant yellow ray for all the
f sodium, and a red ray, of low but definite refrangi-
characteristic of salts of potassium. "If," he says,
opinion should be correct and applicable to the other
e rays, a glance at the prismatic spectrum of a
may show it to contain substances which it would
rise require a laborious chemical analysis to effect."
vas prophetic. In 1834,§ he described the difference

---

ln. Phil. Trans., v. Miller Chem. Phys.
ıcycl. Metrop., p. 438.
ewster's Journ. of Science, vol. v., v. Miller, Chem. Phys.
& E. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Sc., vol. iv., p. 114.

between the spectra of strontium and lithium. "Hence I hesitate not to say," he tells us, "that optical analysi can distinguish the minutest portions of these two sub stances from each other with as much certainty, if no more, than by any other known method."

In 1832, Brewster* first noticed the absorption bands pr duced by colored gases. He showed that the brownish-re vapors of nitrous acid absorb the sun's rays, so as to produc dark bands in the spectrum of the transmitted beam. H noticed lines and bands in the red and green spaces whic sometimes disappeared, and found it to be due to absor tion by the earth's atmosphere, which acts most powerful near D. This, then, shows the dependence of certain of t fixed lines of the spectrum on our atmosphere. These labo were destined to play no small part in subsequent disco ries, and they directed the attention of many philosoph to this subject.

W. H. Miller and Daniell† showed, in 1833, that oth colored vapors possessed the same property. In 183 Wheatstone‡ made a prismatic decomposition of the electr voltaic, and electro-magnetic sparks. He states that t spectra of the electro-magnetic spark, taken from mercu zinc, cadmium, tin, bismuth, and lead, in the melted state, co sist of definite rays separated by dark intervals from ea other; but the number, position, and colors of the lines va in each case. He readily distinguishes the metals from ea other in this manner. He concludes that the light does n arise from the combustion of the metal, by taking the volta spark from mercury in vacuum, in air, in carbonic acid, a in oxygen, and finding identical spectra.

These experiments are the first of a long series afterwar attempted by other observers, which have greatly extend our knowledge in this direction. In 1839, Cooper§ observ an extension of the red portion of the solar spectrum, obtain in the ordinary way, beyond the space it occupies when se by the naked eye, by viewing it through a piece of deep bl cobalt glass. This new part of the spectrum is crossed b two or more very broad lines or bands.

In 1843, 1847, and 1848, Draper|| published a series

* L. & E. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Sc., vol. viii., p. 384.
† L. & E. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Sc., 3d series, vol. ii., p. 381
‡ Proc. of Brit. Assoc.
§ Proc. of Roy. Soc., vol. iv., 146.
|| L., E. & D. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Science, 3d series, vol. xxii., p. 36 Vol. xxx., p. 360. Vol. xxxii., p. 100.

three papers on spectral analysis. They mark the fourth epoch in the history of this science; Newton, Fraunhofer, and Brewster having established the three first. In these remarkable labors, in which facts hitherto isolated and unintelligible were connected and explained, as well as new phenomena noted, deductions so extraordinary were made, that not only was a broad and safe foundation laid for future workers in this field, but a landmark in chemical science itself was erected. In 1843, he stated his experience in making prismatic analysis by the use of sensitive papers, his experiments dating back to 1834. By the aid of perfected apparatus and improved photographic processes, he procures a tithonograph, as he terms it, in which the visible solar spectrum is greatly extended. The apparatus consisted essentially of a heliostat, a slit of parallel knife-edges $\frac{1}{32}$ of an inch wide, an equiangular flint-glass prism, eleven feet off, and an achromatic lens. On his plate he shows that beyond the red ray there are three extra spectral lines, "α," "β," and "γ," and that beyond the violet, and out of the visible limits of the spectrum, four very striking groups appear. He marks the first lines of each group, "M," "N," "O," "P."

Besides these larger groups, the whole tithonograph is crossed by hundreds of minuter ones (about 600 between "H" and "P"). "If the absorptive action of the sun's atmosphere be the cause of this phenomenon, that action takes place much more powerfully on the more refrangible and extra spectral region." This field, first worked by Prof. Draper, has since been elaborated and applied to chemical analysis. He called attention to the relative visibility of Fraunhofer's lines when seen at different periods. The red are more visible as the sun approaches the horizon, and those at the more refrangible end of the spectrum are obvious in the middle of the day. In 1847, he determined, first, the point of incandescence of platinum, and proved that different bodies become red hot at the same temperature; he also determined, secondly, the color of the rays emitted by self-luminous bodies at different temperatures; this is done by the only reliable method—analysis by the prism. From these experiments it will appear, that as the temperature rises the light increases in refrangibility, and the true order of the colors is red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. He determined, thirdly, the relation between the brilliancy of the light emitted by a shining body and its temperature. Here he found that the intensity of the light increased far more rapidly than the temperature. He

showed that the temperature of incandescence of platinum i 977° Fahr., and that that is about the temperature at whicl all solids begin to shine in a very dark room; all solids shine then, at the same thermometric point. He pointed out th temperature of incandescence as a natural fixed point for th thermometer.

In the second determination, he described his prismati apparatus, and used for a standard scale the fixed solar lines "In the *prismatic* spectra," he says, "the true relationship o the colors is not perceived, because the less refrangible ar crowded together, and the more refrangible unduly sprea out; but in the *interference* spectrum, where the colors ar arranged side by side in the order of their wave-lengths, th centre is occupied by the most luminous portion of th yellow, and from this point the light declines away, on on side in the reds, and on the other in the blues, the termi nations being equidistant from the centre of the yellow space." He described the imperfections of the eye, an the mistakes to which they might give rise in observing spectral effects. He recognised the truth of what wa at that time a theoretical statement of Newton's proposi tion, viz.: "To a particular color there ever belongs a par ticular wave-length, and to a particular wave-length there ever belongs a particular color." Here he foresaw th modern experimental demonstrations, which have caused th wave theory of Young to be universally adopted as a law.

In the third branch of his enquiry, he examined the re lation between the temperatures of self-luminous bodies and the intensity of the light they emit. From the analogy between heat and light, he reasons that, as the tem perature of an incandescent solid rises, the intensity o the light emitted increases very rapidly, and then prove it experimentally. The use of a platinum wire, ignited to a known temperature by a voltaic current used in his experiments, suggests to him its application as a unit-lamp o artificial light of standard brilliancy. He gives six tabula spectra, five of platinum at different temperatures compared with one of the sun. This was the first monogram so illus trated. It is foreign to our subject to allude to the great importance of the discovery of a new fixed thermometric point; but the *unit-lamp* is a gift to this branch of science of the first value, inasmuch as it may be applied to the de termination of the temperature at which the substance we are examining is vaporizing.

In 1848, Draper published some experiments so philosophical, taken in connection with his deductions from them, that he deserves to be remembered with Lavoisier and Faraday. In this memoir he traced the connection between the chemical conditions under which a body burns, and the nature of the light which it emits. Davy proved that all common flames are incandescent shells, the interior of which is dark, and that the relative quantity of light emitted depends on the temporary disengagement of solid particles. This was a great fundamental discovery, but here he stopped—the enquiry was completed by Draper. Only by a general examination of the light arising from various solids, vapors, and gases when burning, can we obtain data for a true theory of combustion; this must be one of the fundamental theories of chemistry; it must include the nature of all chemical changes whatsoever. Prof. Draper made a prismatic analysis of the flames of various vapors and gases, proving that they yield all the colors of the spectrum. He showed that every prismatic color is found in every flame (there being no monochromatic flame, no matter what its color). The instrumental arrangement consisted essentially of a horizontal slit, one-thirtieth of an inch wide and one inch long, the rays of the flame it transmitted being received on a flint-glass prism about seven feet off, the axis of which was parallel to the slit, the spectrum being viewed with a telescope which had a divided micrometer and parallel wires in the eye-piece. It was adjusted for analysing a horizontal section of any part of a lamp-flame; when a vertical element was examined, the slit and prism were set vertically. He showed, as we will see, the great advantages possessed by the former method. He examined the flames of oil, alcohol, boracic acid, nitrate of strontia, phosphorus, sulphur, carbonic oxide, hydrogen, cyanogen, arseniuretted hydrogen, &c. He not only found every prismatic color, but even bright Fraunhoferian lines of different colors. Having made a prismatic analysis of the light of an elementary solid, burning at different temperatures, he proved that as the temperature rises the more refrangible rays appear.

The spectrum of burning anthracite coal was examined, and of charcoal burning in oxygen, which demonstrated that there is a connection between the refrangibility of the light which a burning body yields, and the intensity of the chemical action going on; and that the refrangibility always increases as the chemical action increases. He proved that

flames consist of a series of concentric and differently colored shells. Common flames consist of thin shells of ignited matter, the interior being dark, combustion only going on in the portion near the atmosphere; this ignited shell has sensible thickness.

If we imagine it to consist of series of strata, it is obvious that the conditions of combustion are different for each; as we advance inwards, the activity of the burning must decline. As combustion is more active, rays of a higher degree of refrangibility are evolved; it follows that each point of the superficies of every flame must yield all the colors of the spectrum; the violet coming from the outer strata, the yellow from the intermediate, and the red from those within.

If we could isolate an elementary horizontal section of a flame, it would exhibit the appearance of a rainbow ring; and when those compound rays are received on the face of a prism, the constituent colors are parted out by reason of their different refrangibility, and the eye thus made sensitive of their actual existence. He thus examined rays that came from the different enveloping strata of flames. For certain chemical reasons, he examined various gases, emitted from a jet-pipe, instead of using coal. The slit was horizontal. If it had been vertical, the constituent colors would have separated, but their relative position would not have been shown. A horizontal section of a flame presents a colored ring, red internally, and violet externally; and when a horizontal prism separates these colors, the sides of the resulting spectrum ought not to be parallel, but inclined to one another, the breadth being least in the red, and increasing as we pass to the violet.

This increasing breadth proves that the constituent colored shells of the flame envelop each other, the violet being outermost, and therefore broadest. He explained the nature of colored flames, showing, for example, why carbonic oxide burns blue, and cyanogen red. He gives these tabular spectra (with "D," or, as he calls it, "Brewster's yellow ray," for his fixed line), viz.: the solar spectrum as standard, that of a spirit-lamp, of carbonic oxide, cyanogen in air, cyanogen in oxygen, oil-lamp in air, oil-lamp in oxygen, hydrogen in oxygen, nitrate of strontia, and blowpipe cone. Carbonic oxide burning in air yields rays of every color. The more refrangible rays predominate, and it is the excess of these that gives the flame its characteristic blue tint. With carbonic oxide, a very limited supply of oxygen can bring

about the maximum chemical action, and therefore liberate an abundance of rays of maximum refrangibility.

This condition of things is inverted in the case of cyanogen: it is the nature of its flame to be enveloped, as it were, in a sheet of nitrogen arising from its own burning, and this necessarily impedes the access of air and checks the intensity of the chemical change, a check which is at once betokened by the emission of a predominant number of rays of a low refrangibility, or of a red color. But there is a striking difference in the chemical conditions under which carbonic oxide and cyanogen burn: in the case of the former, the whole gas is combustible, in the latter the carbon alone, and we have in reality introduced an incombustible element into the flame, for as the carbon burns the incombustible nitrogen is set free. It occurred to Draper that this condition should impress a physical characteristic on the flame. He thought that dark lines might appear in the spectrum as the result, and experiment justified the inference.

Want of space forbids us to review the important statements he gives concerning this spectrum. Carbonic oxide burnt in oxygen should not change its tint, because common air carries on the process to its maximum effect. Not so with cyanogen; if burnt in oxygen it should emit rays of higher refrangibility; he proved these statements experimentally. Cyanogen burnt in oxygen loses its pink tint; he examined it with his spectral apparatus, and remarked, far out of the limits of the ordinary spectrum, a very distinct violet ray. He showed that the introduction of air into the interior of a flame destroyed the red and orange strata, converting them into violet. As to the physical cause of the production of light by chemical action, he considered that all chemical combinations are attended by a rapid vibratory motion of the parts of the combining bodies, which vibrations become more frequent as the chemical action is more intense.

The burning particles which constitute the inner shell of a flame, execute about four hundred billions of vibrations in one second, and those in the middle about six hundred billions, and those on the exterior, in contact with the air, about eight hundred billions in the same time. The quality of the emitted light as respects its color, depending on the frequency with which those vibrations are accomplished, increases in refrangibility as the violence of the chemical action becomes greater. The parts of all material

bodies are in a state of incessant vibration; that which we call temperature depends on the frequency and amplitude of those vibrations conjointly. If, by any process, as by chemical agencies, we increase that frequency to between four and eight hundred billions of vibrations in one second, ignition or combustion results. In the case of the former of these numbers, the temperature is 977° Fahr.

At this temperature, the waves propagated in the ether impress the organ of vision with a red light; this is also the temperature of the innermost shell of a flame. If the frequency of vibration still increases, the temperature correspondingly rises, and the light successively becomes orange, yellow, green, blue, &c., and this condition obtains in the successive strata of a flame, as we pass from the exterior to the interior. There is then a connection between the vehemence with which chemical affinity is satisfied, and the refrangibility of the resulting light—a simple consequence of the undulatory theory.

It is natural that all chemical changes should be attended by vibratory motions in the particles of the bodies engaged; that these vibrations should increase in frequency as the action becomes more violent; but an increased frequency of vibration is the same thing as an increased refrangibility. He thinks that in this manner the theory of ethereal undulations is on the point of including many of those fundamental facts in chemistry which at present appear to have no connection with it. The modern theory of the correlation and conservation of forces realized his conviction a few years afterwards. He pointed out a very remarkable numerical relation existing amongst the fixed lines of the solar spectrum, expressible by a simple arithmetical progression, showing that the cause of them must be periodic in its action. The appearance of these lines in the interference spectrum is noted. Every flame which gives fixed lines in its spectrum, uniformly disengages incombustible matter. Thus closes a series of experiments and deductions which have been attacked and as frequently defended by the most illustrious philosophers. They appeared before the wonderful results of the labors of Bunsen and Kirchhoff had brought these matters more generally before the public; we could not appreciate their significance then as we do now.

In 1845, W. A. Miller* published the spectra of a great

* L., E. & D. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Sc., 3d series, vol. xxvii., p. 81.

number of metals; their salts were dissolved in the alcohol of a spirit-lamp. He showed that the mere existence of color in a vapor does not indicate of necessity the existence of bands in its spectrum. The probable position of the lines cannot be inferred from the color of the gas. Simple bodies as well as compounds may produce lines; and two simple bodies, which singly do not produce them, may in their compounds occasion them abundantly. Lines may exist in the vapor of simple substances, which disappear in their compounds. Sometimes the same lines are produced by different degrees of oxidation of the same substances. In 1849, Foucault* caused the image of the sun to fall on the voltaic arc, and viewing this compound light through a prism, he observed that the double brilliant line of the arc coincided exactly with the double black line of the solar light, and when they overlapped the black line of the solar spectrum was rendered considerably more intense.

Kirchhoff was soon to deduce conclusions from a similar experiment, which would rivet the attention of the whole scientific world. In 1851 and 1855, Massont examined the spectra produced by various metals which were employed as dischargers to the Leyden jar, and also when heated by the voltaic arc. In 1855, Angstrom‡ showed that owing to the intense heat of the electric discharges employed by Masson, he obtained two spectra simultaneously, one due to the metal, the other to the atmosphere itself, which became ignited. By causing the spark to pass between the same metals when immersed in various gases, the particular lines due to the metal remained unaltered, whilst the others due to the gaseous medium disappeared, and were replaced by new lines. In 1859, Van der Willigen§ placed in succession, upon a pair of wires, small quantities of weak solutions of various alkaline chlorides, and noticed the production of metallic bands in addition to those belonging to the metal of which his wires were composed; these bands were characteristic of the particular metal contained in each of these several compounds. In 1859, Maxwell‖ used a spectral apparatus consisting of slit, lens, and two prisms, arranged in two dark communicating chambers at an angle of

* Journal de l'Institut, Feb. 7th, 1849.
† Ann. de Chimie., III. xxxi. 295. xlv. 387.
‡ L., E. & D. Phil. Mag. & Journ. of Sc., 4th series, vol. ix. p. 327.
§ Pogg. Annal., cvi. p. 617.
‖ Proc. of the Roy. Soc., vol. x. p. 404.

100°, to determine the wave-lengths of each kind of ligh so that results obtained by one observer might be render comparable with those obtained by another with differe apparatus.

In 1858 and 1859, Plücker* examined the spectra of tl electric current in rarefied gases and vapors. A capillar tube was used: he got a brilliant luminous line within th tube, of which a beautiful spectrum was obtained by repl cing the distant illuminated slit which Fraunhofer used i his observations by the self-luminous line; afterwards h employed Babinet's goniometer. The slit of this instrumer was illuminated by the current within the capillary tub which was placed before it at about a distance of 0.4 of a inch. The aperture of the slit was seen under a constan angle of 3′ as a general rule. After interposing the prism o heavy flint-glass, "the refracted image of the slit in the ge neral case was found to be divided into a less or greater num ber of differently colored bands, appearing each under th just mentioned constant angle of 3′." Hence it follows tha the analysed electric light is "composed of a certain numbe of rays whose refrangibility is a discontinuous one." Thes bands he resolved into two or more. He observed a brigh line in the middle of the bands, and dark lines dividing them In order to distinguish the rays of different refrangibility i the different gases, he marked each ray by adding to th symbol of the gas one of the Greek letters. He records the physical condition of certain bands of the spectra o nitrogen, mercury, and bi-chloride of tin. Exact measure were obtained of the minimum refraction of the differen rays. The hydrogen spectrum was the standard.

From the angles of refraction Plucker deduced the in dices of refraction, and the corresponding lengths of wave expressed in millionths of a millimetre, in order to get abso lute numbers immediately comparable with those of others The hydrogen spectrum with his apparatus consisted of onl three bright bands, red, bluish green (fainter), and viole (still fainter). He gave a table of the angles of refractior &c., corresponding to each of the three rays, "$H\alpha$," "$H\beta$," "$H\gamma$," as well as of Fraunhofer's lines, C, F, G, in order t compare their reciprocal position. It shows that "$H\beta$ exactly coincides with "F," while "$H\alpha$" and "$H\gamma$" ap proach very near C and G. He described the spectra o

*Pogg. Annal., and Proc. of the Roy. Soc., vol. x. p. 264.

oxygen, nitrogen (one of the richest in colors, having from the exterior of the red to the limit of the yellow seventeen equidistant small dark bands), carbonic oxide, iodine, bromine, chlorine, &c. A piece of metallic sodium, in an atmosphere of rarefied hydrogen, does not alter the spectrum of the gas at ordinary temperatures; but heat being applied, a single brilliant yellow band appears, as also the original hydrogen bands. The middle of the new band exactly coincides with Fraunhofer's dark line "D." Phosphorus treated in the same way at a certain temperature extinguishes the hydrogen spectrum. He observed with mercury that an increase of heat increased the brilliancy of the spectrum; he got peculiar bands without heating it at all. When traces of two gases not acting on each other are mixed within a spectrum tube, the spectra of both are simultaneously obtained.

A result following these researches is where Fraunhofer's dark lines were used in order to get exact measures; they may, with great advantage, be replaced by the middle lines of the new brilliant bands of the gas spectra; to these bands the most convenient breadth may be given, in each particular case, by regulating the aperture of the apparatus. A spectrum tube of hydrogen, exhibiting three well-defined bright bands, is well suited for this purpose; during a whole year such a tube remained absolutely unaltered. Every gas being characterized by its spectrum (even by one of the bands of the spectrum, the position of which is measured), "*we get a new kind of chemical analysis.*" He described the analyses of various mixed gases and vapors. By the aid of this form of analysis, he discovered the following facts: combinations of hydrogen with metals, with chlorine, etc., are nearly all almost instantly decomposed by the electric discharge; sulphur and arsenic are deposited from their combinations with hydrogen by it. These and many other facts he described in detail, giving the most curious results and intensely interesting phenomena. The selenium spectrum is given, and experiments with sulphurous acid. He thinks it most probable that "the electric light does not exist—the light which we see belongs to the gas, rendered incandescent by the thermal action of the current."

This work of Plucker is the last and one of the most important of those preliminary researches in the field where the German philosophers Bunsen and Kirchhoff have since immortalized their names, and where Miller, Huggins, Ruther-

furd, Secchi, Donati, and other astronomers, have, with thei prisms and telescopes, raised the roof of the analytical chem ist's laboratory high enough to include the stars; it is als the last to which we shall refer on the present occasion, bu we shall not fail to return to the subject.

ART VIII.—*The President's Message, and other Public Documents* December, 1864.

WE do not take up the President's Message for the pur pose of making any unfriendly remarks. There is no reaso why we should entertain any such feeling towards Mr. Lin coln. We are not politicians; we have never voted for an one. We have never advocated the claims of any party a such, and probably never will. To us, Republicans an Democrats are all the same, except so far as we think, fro time to time, that the former pursue a more statesman-lik course than the latter, and *vice versa*. Of republicans i general we entertain a higher opinion than we do of dem crats, because we think they advocate a higher civilizatio Did we vote for any candidate, we would, therefore, do s for a republican, provided we thought him qualified for th position which he sought. Personally we know nothing Mr. Lincoln. We have never had the honor of speaking word to him; never written him a line; never made any a plication to him, directly or indirectly. Why, then, shou we have any dislike towards the man, that would cause us speak harshly of him?

It were different, indeed, were Mr. Lincoln's princip Secretary our subject; although our feelings towards th latter, high as is his present position, is much more one contempt than dislike; and we think that his own letters our possession, considered in connection with the circu stances to which they relate, would satisfy any unprejudic person that he should not be made the object of any high feeling, except scorn can be regarded in that light. Yet w trust that when we come to examine the conduct even of th Secretary of State, we can do so in the language of justi and moderation, and without transcending in any mann the bounds of legitimate criticism.

We were never in favor of Mr. Lincoln's election to th presidency, simply because we did not consider him qualifie

for that high position. That he honestly meant to do his best we have never doubted, because such has been the almost universal verdict. But the best intentions and highest integrity, excellent qualities though they are, require the aid of certain faculties which Mr. Lincoln does not possess. Yet we have not opposed his re-election in any way. Not that our estimate of his abilities had undergone any material change; but we thought it would be injudicious to put any untried man in his place until the war is over, lest he might do still worse than Mr. Lincoln. And this has been the feeling of the most intelligent republicans with whom we have conversed on the subject, in different parts of the country. Their general remark before the late election was: "We know too well that Mr. Lincoln is not qualified for the position he holds at the present crisis; it requires far more energy, resolution, and statesman-like ability than he possesses; but who would suit better just now?" Others would say: "There are vastly better qualified men—men who would do us some credit at home and abroad; but they are not available. There would be no use in nominating such; the people would not elect one of them." These are undoubtedly the arguments which re-elected Mr. Lincoln, and it cannot be denied that they are founded in reason and truth. Were it even otherwise, it would be the duty of every citizen who is in favor of preserving the country from dismemberment to give his administration a cordial support, at least in any measure or course of policy the design and tendency of which are to suppress the rebellion, or restore the integrity of the nation.

We have never uttered a word in favor of secession, but have always spoken against it, because we hold that it is as much the natural right of a nation to protect itself from dismemberment as it is that of an individual to protect the members of his body from mutilation. In one case as well as in the other, if we are overpowered and exhausted, reason and common sense require us to submit; but we hold that under no other circumstances is it honorable to do so. But the Federal States are in no danger of being either overpowered or exhausted as long as no great foreign powers intervene, and, therefore, should not submit to dismemberment. The question is not, whether the North would be as well without the Southern States as with them, but what would the principle of forcible separation lead to if once conceded? How many republics, all inimical to each other,

might we not have in a few years? Is it not better to hav one effectual war, gigantic though it be, and lasting eve for seven years, than to run the risk of half a dozen wars a once, some of which would be likely to be interminable?

At the same time, we should not forget that our presen enemies were our former friends; that they are in fact ou own flesh and blood. In any case bitter or abusive languag gains no victories. The horrors of war are bad enough by themselves without aggravating them by taunts and insults This remark applies with ten-fold force in our case, since the object of the war is to compel the insurgents to resume their duties as our fellow-citizens. Who would induce his former partner in business to unite his fortunes with him again by abuse? Would not any such attempt be absurd? It would not be more so, however, or more unnatural, than to pursue a similar course towards those who have rebelled against us but whom we are squandering our money and our blood like water to bring back to their allegiance.

We do not mean that the North errs in this respect more than the South, nor even as much; and we also bear in mind that it was not the North that began the war. But the strongest side should be the more generous, and the less disposed to play the woman by making injudicious use of the tongue in the moment of anger. If the rebels will abuse us, let them do so; it will hurt themselves and their cause more than us. We claim to have a higher civilization; then why not speak, as well as act, accordingly? It would be much wiser as well as more respectable to give our enemies full credit for their good natural qualities, in spite of their being such. There is no good reason, for example, why we should deny that, whatever the faults of the Southerners are, they are hospitable and generous at their own homes in time of peace. We believe that none who have travelled amongst them, and treated them courteously, have failed to see evidences enough of these qualities. If they would not treat us hospitably now even as private individuals, or noncombatants, they are not peculiar in this respect. The English, the French, the Spaniards, or any other people, however generous or courteous, would not treat the inhabitants of a country at which they are at war, as they would those of a country whose relations with them are entirely friendly.

It can hardly be inferred from these introductory remarks that we are in the least degree hostile either to Mr. Lincoln, or the party to which he belongs; or that we have

any other interest to subserve than that of truth and the public good in taking up his Message. An additional proof of this may, we think, be found in our forbearing to make such criticisms on the style of that document, as its glaring violations, at almost every paragraph, of the principles of the English language, would naturally elicit. We prefer to express our regret in general terms, that the President of the United States should put forth a document whose syntax throughout is so much like that of a school-boy making his earlier efforts in "composition," rather than make remarks having a tendency to turn the dialect of our chief-magistrate into ridicule.

It is otherwise, however, with the manner in which that document is arranged, or rather disarranged. A more confused, or incoherent state paper we have never read in any language; although the information which it gives is multifarious, and in general of a satisfactory nature. It is a fundamental principle in statesmanship and diplomacy, that in all documents the most important subjects should receive most prominence; the only exception to this is that presented by the Machiavellian policy, according to which the most important topic is introduced at the close, like the postscript to a lady's letter. Even in this case, the fact that it is the most important is concealed; the object being to deceive the party to whom the document is addressed. We entirely acquit Mr. Lincoln of all intention of this kind; although one of his chief advisers has all the tortuous, crooked ways of Machiavelli without one-twentieth the abilities of that unscrupulous politician.

But let us look at the Message as it stands. Mr. Lincoln only writes two sentences before he informs us that "Mexico continues to be a theatre of civil war, *while* our relations with that country have undergone no change. We have *at the same time* maintained neutrality between the belligerents." We receive information in the next paragraph in relation to certain "difficulties" with the states of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, which are now happily adjusted. A still more important fact, if possible, is stated in the fourth paragraph, namely, that "The new liberal constitution of Nevada having gone into effect with the *universal acquiescence* of the people, the government under it has been recognised, and diplomatic intercourse with it *has arisen* in a cordial and friendly spirit."

Passing over another paragraph or two of a similar char-

acter, we come to the following remark: "During the past year no difference of any kind *has arisen* with any of these republics, and, on the other hand, they sympathize with the United States, and *are constantly expressing cordiality and earnestness.*" The fact that those states are thus "constantly expressing" themselves about our affairs may, perhaps, account for the somewhat confused condition of their own. Further on we are told that "civil war continues in the Spanish part of San Domingo, *apparently without prospect* of an early close." All this time our own war is not as much as mentioned. We skip another paragraph or two, and come to the following important announcement: "Official correspondence has been freely opened with Liberia, and it gives us a pleasing view of social and political progress in that republic. * * I solicit your authority to furnish to the republic a gunboat, at moderate cost, to be reimbursed to the United States by instalments."

We do not object to this sort of thing, because the people of Liberia are negroes, or because we have any sympathy with the advocates of slavery at home. We are believers now, as we always have been, in the sentiment of Sterne, "Disguise it as thou wilt, still, Slavery, thou art a bitter draught." There is nothing Mr. Lincoln has tried to accomplish for which we give him more credit than for his efforts in favor of the total abolition of slavery. It has ever been our wish to see this blot removed, but never without respecting vested rights. Those who rebel and try to overthrow the government have no such rights—they remain in force only with those who continue loyal. The former should lose their slaves, but the latter should be compensated to the full extent for theirs, since it was not they who introduced the system.

It will be seen, then, that it is not on the ground of color or race that we object to the introduction of the long paragraph on the subject of Liberia, before one word has been said on the subject of the gigantic rebellion in which we are ourselves engaged. But were we in the enjoyment of the most profound peace, there would still be other topics which would claim precedence, in a document like that before us, of the Republic of Liberia. The first allusion from which any one would infer from the President's Message that we are at war, occurs at the close of the eleventh paragraph, as follows: "Thus, it is hoped that with the return of domestic peace the country will be able to resume with energy

and advantages, our former high career of commerce and civilization."

One would think that once introduced, the subject would be dwelt upon at some length; but no. The pith of what we are informed in the next paragraph is, that "our relations with Egypt, as well as our relations with the Barbary powers, are *entirely satisfactory*." Those who had any apprehensions from those quarters, may now feel fully re-assured. From Egypt Mr. Lincoln takes a characteristic stride to China and Japan, and makes some curious observations about each of those nations. Thus, for example, in speaking of the former, he says: "The rebellion which has so long been *flagrant* in China has at last been suppressed, with the co-operation and good offices of this government and the other Western commercial states." If the Chinese saw this they would be apt to say, "Physician, why not heal thyself?"

After Japan has been disposed of in a manner equally summary, we are informed at last that "the ports of Norfolk, Fernandina, and Pensacola have been opened by proclamation." This suggests to Mr. Lincoln certain ideas on maritime affairs, and prompts him to give us the following curious and somewhat hypothetical piece of information: "Disloyal emissaries have been neither *less assiduous* nor *more successful* during the last year than they were before that time, in their efforts, under favor of that privilege, to embroil our country in foreign wars." The maritime states receive a handsome compliment; and we are told that although certain vexatious things sometimes happen on our Canadian frontier, "the colonial authorities of Canada are not deemed to be *internationally* unjust or unfriendly towards the United States; but, *on the contrary*, there is every reason to expect that, with the approval of the Imperial government, they will take the necessary measures to prevent new incursions across the border."

After Mr. Lincoln has thus settled the affairs of numerous governments of Europe, Asia, and America, including despotisms, limited monarchies, democracies, oligarchies, &c., &c., he proceeds to tell us something about home affairs. And what seems most strange to us is that he seems to understand the business of all others much better than his own. He knows exactly what is going on, not only in Mexico and all the South American republics, but also what is passing in the remotest parts of China and Japan; but he is satisfied with

the vaguest hearsay as to what is passing at home, within fifty miles of his residence. In short, judging from his Message, he knows vastly more about the Chinese rebels than he does about those rebels against whom Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and others are fighting; although he could easily inform himself as to the conduct of the latter, if it were not so dangerous to life and limb to venture within range of their batteries.

It is pleasant to learn from our chief-magistrate that "we have more men now than we had at the beginning of the war," "that we are gaining strength, and may, if need be, maintain the contest indefinitely;" but it seems we may thank the despotisms of Europe for this, and those "foreigners" who not very long ago were to be regarded only as an element of danger to the country, and whose coming amongst us should accordingly be discouraged by every true patriot and enlightened statesman. Mr. Lincoln himself is very much slandered, if he did not at one time advance arguments of this kind against foreign emigration to our shores. Be this as it may, Time is an excellent instructor in the science of political economy, as will sufficiently appear from the following extract from the document before us:

"The act passed at the last session for the encouragement of emigration has, as far as was possible, been put into operation. It seems to need an amendment which will enable the officers of the government to prevent the practice of frauds against the emigrants while on their way and on their arrival in the ports, so as to secure them here a free choice of avocations and places of settlement. A liberal disposition towards this great national policy is manifested by most of the European states, and ought to be reciprocated on our part by giving the emigrants effective national protection. I regard our emigrants as one of the *principal replenishing streams which are appointed by Providence to repair the ravages of internal war and its wastes of national strength and health*. All that is necessary is to secure the flow of that stream in its present fulness, and to that end the government must in every way make it manifest that it neither needs nor designs to impose involuntary military service upon those who come from other lands to cast their lot in our country."

The statement that we have more men now than we had at the beginning of the war is repeated at least half a dozen times in different parts of the Message. We should be glad to think it true; but we fear Mr. Lincoln is mistaken. If otherwise, why is it that employers in all kinds of business find it impossible to get sufficient men even for three times the wages they used formerly to pay? How is it that so many buildings have had to be left unfinished for want of

hands? How is it that women and children have in numerous instances to occupy positions in stores and workshops, as well as in manufactories, formerly occupied by men? Any intelligent person from New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, could have informed Mr. Lincoln on those points, and thereby put him on his guard against making statements which at best are of doubtful accuracy.

But assuming that we really have more men than we had three or four years ago, this, it will be admitted, affords an additional reason why the rebellion should have been put down before this, since it is not pretended that it was all of a sudden, or *en masse*, we got those large additions to our strength, from Europe, on which the President very properly congratulates the country, but in a continuous "stream." No such stream has come to the rebels. According to all accounts they are constantly growing weaker and weaker; yet Mr. Lincoln has utterly failed to reduce them to subjection, or bring them back to their allegiance, in nearly four years.

In our opinion he has had men and means enough to do so. That he will continue to have both we have no doubt; for the people throughout Europe, especially those who make the best soldiers, and are most willing to fight, have much more sympathy for the United States than is generally supposed by our own citizens. And there is abundant reason why they should. There are few, if any of them, who had not friends in this country before the war commenced. If those friends did not aid them with their superfluous earnings, they, at least, gave them to understand that generally—indeed almost universally—they were well treated. Those who had never voted before, voted here. Not a few obtained offices of trust and emolument; a considerable number made fortunes, which at their death they bequeathed partly or wholly to their poor relatives in Europe.

In the South it has been different. The characteristic hospitality of the Southerners—generous and conspicuous as it undoubtedly has been—has always failed to counteract the influence of slavery in preventing emigration. No amount of hospitality or good nature could induce the laboring class to compete with the negro or with slave labor, as long as they thought they could do nearly as well where no such anomaly existed. They would choose the latter, even if they thought the employers of the North less friendly towards them, or less disposed to treat them well, which, upon the whole, they had no just grounds to believe; for, after all, we

do not believe that the better classes of the Northerners a less hospitable, or less disposed to treat foreigners in as ki a manner as they deserve, than the corresponding classes Southerners. Thus, then, we have had every advanta from the beginning, including an abundance of money. N sovereign, however great or powerful, had more unbound resources at his disposal for suppressing an insurrection, even for wholly subjugating a foreign country, than M Lincoln has had; but it is equally undeniable that, in all h tory, we do not find one who has made less effectual u of those resources.

We hope, however, it may be different in the future. I must have learned from the experience of nearly four yea that more energy is required from the President of the Unit States in a crisis like the present, than he has hitherto exhi ited. Indeed, in some respects, we see evidences of impro ment already. Mr. Lincoln is not one-tenth as despotic now he was a year or two ago. He no longer emulates the Cz in arbitrary arrests, breaking into people's houses, draggi out their inmates, male or female, and incarcerating them dungeons in defiance of all law.

That many of those treated in this manner deserved be punished, and quite as severely as they were, far be from us to deny; but all whose mother tongue is the Ang Saxon, have been nurtured in those principles of law a justice, one of the most important of which is, that eve man is to be assumed innocent until some crime has be proved against him; or, what amounts nearly to the sam that a man's house is his castle. When war actually prevai these precepts may, indeed, be modified, but at no time, f example, during the present rebellion, has it prevailed New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, whereas, arrests of th character alluded to have been made at each.

In peace or war it is perfectly proper to arrest the against whom there exists any reasonable suspicion as to the having perpetrated crime; but it is not perfectly proper any time, except where war is actually raging, or proper a all, but very wrong to suspend the *habeas corpus* in the case. The same remarks will apply still more emphatical to the arbitrary arrests of editors and the suppression of the papers. The government of the United States had no nee to descend to petty tyranny of this kind. In the darke hour of the Republic it had sufficient vitality to bear an criticism, however adverse, made upon it by pen or tongu

And in every instance in which the arbitrary course was pursued, it injured our cause at home and abroad much more than it served it. The most thoughtful regarded it as a sign of weakness; and in one sense so it was, but not in the sense it was generally taken abroad. In reality it only showed that those who caused those arbitrary arrests were weak in mind, and head.

And they have evidently realized the fact themselves since; for never did the sympathizers with the rebellion speak out more boldly than they do at the present moment. There is at least one daily journal in New York which is as much in the interest of Jefferson Davis as if it were published at Richmond, and patronized by the rebel government; but it is allowed to utter its treason daily without any attempt being made to suppress it, or to incarcerate its editors or publishers. This shows that Mr. Lincoln has made some progress in learning to understand the American people, who do not like exhibitions of arbitrary power. It is very clear that they are in favor of putting down the rebellion; but equally clear that they do not like to see a troop of soldiers break into any one's house or office, seize and drag him to a dungeon, merely because he has said or published something that Mr. Lincoln or his Secretary does not relish. If we are not much mistaken, the universal sentiment throughout the North is this: If a writer or speaker evinces active sympathy with the rebels, or pursues any course calculated to aid them in their efforts to dismember the country, let him, by all means, be duly prosecuted, and if found guilty, let such punishment be inflicted upon him as the law has prescribed in such cases. If, instead of this, the courts are ignored; if our judges issue their writs only to be scoffed at, then it is but a mockery to pretend that we enjoy the benefits of self-government, no matter what name we may call the individual who exercises such power, for it is not the title he receives, but the acts he performs that determine whether he is the representative and servant, or the master and oppressor of the people.

The terms still held out to the insurgents, are, we think, not unfair or unreasonable; they have no right to expect better. We cheerfully copy the three paragraphs which have reference to this subject, for they contain by far the most sensible remarks in the whole Message, which, as they are the last, ends much better than it begins:

"A year ago a general pardon and amnesty, upon specified terms, were offered to all except certain designated classes, and it was at the same

time made known that the excepted classes were still within the contemplation of special clemency. During the year many availed themselves of the general provision, and many more would, only that the signs of bad faith in some, led to such precautionary measures as rendered the practical process less easy and certain. During the same time, also, special pardons have been granted to individuals of the excepted class, and no voluntary application has been denied; thus practically the door has been for a full year open to all, except such as were not in condition to make a free choice; that is, such as were in custody or under restraint. It is still open to all, but the time may come, probably will come, when public duty shall demand that it be closed, and that it be more rigorous than heretofore.

"In presenting the abandonment of armed resistance to the national authority on the part of the insurgent states as the only indispensable condition to ending the war on the part of the government, I retract nothing heretofore said. As to slavery I repeat the declaration made a year ago, and add that, while I remain in my present position, I shall not attempt to retract or modify the Emancipation Proclamation, nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation, or by any of the acts of Congress. If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to re-enslave such persons, another, not I, must be their instrument to perform it.

"In stating a single condition of peace, I mean simply to say that the war will cease on the part of the government whenever it shall have ceased on the part of those who began it."

The closing remark of the second paragraph had better been omitted; it shows too much of the politician. Mr. Lincoln knows very well that the people will not ask him or anybody else to re-enslave those who have been liberated. We fear that if he thought they would he would not be so ready to transfer the task to another, but would try to overcome his scruples rather than remove from his present residence. For the rest we hope the rebels may be induced to accept the terms offered. It seems to us that it would be their own interest quite as much as that of the North, to put an end to the horrors of war by simply laying down their arms, especially as there can be little doubt that they will have to do so eventually. Not indeed because they are wanting in courage or bravery; none could have displayed more heroism than they; but their resources in men and money—in all that is essential for carrying on a protracted war, being confessedly so much less than those of the North, they must necessarily become exhausted in time. And none can admit this without also admitting that the sooner they put an end to the war the better. Let us hope, for the sake of North and South alike, that the success of General Sherman, now before Savannah, may be such as to convince the bravest and most desperate that any further resistance to the power of the inexhaustible and resolute North, can only result in disaster and ruin to themselves.

ART. IX.—NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

HISTORY AND TRAVELS.

"*From Dan to Beersheba;*" *or, the Land of Promise as it now appears*, &c., &c. By Rev. J. P. Newman, D. D. 12mo., pp. 485. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1864.

We remember the time when none of our publishers were more careful in their selections than the Messrs. Harper; and we hope they will be so again before long. But lately they have given us some very inferior books. That now before us is one of this character. It is true that were we to judge it by the number of cuts it contains, we should give a different estimate of it. Not, indeed, that they are remarkable either for their neatness or their accuracy. In these respects they are no better than the generality of those which appear in the "Journal of Civilization" and the "Monthly;" and this, we acknowledge, is not speaking very highly in their favor. Yet, if the cuts were the only blemishes, we could easily pass them by, for, except for children, we have not much faith in "pictures" of the class alluded to.

But the letter-press is in worse taste than the illustrations, and staler than the stalest of them. Yet in no similar book, not excepting even Jack the Giant-killer, are we told so many wonderful things. By this we mean no sneer at the facts stated in Scripture; we only allude to the manner in which the author identifies the scenes in which all the most important occurrences related by the inspired writers have taken place; and we think that few will read the book who will not agree with us that except the author pretends to be inspired himself nearly if not quite as much as Moses or Jeremiah, he has undertaken a little too much.

We are told in the preface that the volume before us "is the expansion of a series of letters, published in the 'Methodist,' during that interesting journey." As the "Methodist," so far as we have seen, is conducted with ability, we must come to the conclusion that the "expansion" constitutes the largest and most "wonderful" part of the book, including many "descriptions" which the editor did not care to publish. At all events, if every injudicious passage had been omitted, or every passage that requires in the reader almost sufficient faith to remove mountains, instead of four hundred and eighty-five pages we should scarcely have fifty. Nor would the latter have given us any more satisfactory account than that of the sacred historians.

Our author has a very easy way of measuring the countries which he undertakes to describe, as for example, "three and a half times larger than New Jersey," "twice as large as Maryland," "of equal extent with South Carolina," &c. (p. 18). Speaking of the present "apparent barrenness" of the Holy Land, our author informs us that "the causes of the

change which has taken place in the lapse of so many centuries, *a once natural and miraculous*" (p. 16). This proposition he proceeds great length to demonstrate in due form, establishing the miraculous by a text from Jeremiah.*

But the most curious feature of the work is the facility which the author not only discovers every place of whose ide there is any doubt, but also gives a full and particular accou the event or occurrence from which that place derives its celebrity. Hi to, for example, we had but a vague idea of the manner in which Sa killed so large a number of the Philistines; but the Rev. Dr. Newman cribes the whole affair with a degree of graphicalness and minuteness w leaves nothing to be desired. He also settles the question as t source of Samson's wonderful strength. "As his strength was n his muscles," he says, "so it was not in the seven locks of his When asleep, and at ordinary duties, he was as other men, but whe Philistines were to be punished, the spirit of the Lord came upon (p. 265). How useful such a man would be at the present day; fo could bring the rebels to terms in a shorter time than all our general together. Most people who are not inspired have some difficul understanding how the sun stood still on Gibeon, and the moon i valley of Ajalon; but our author tells us exactly how the whole happened. After showing that the prayer of Joshua was not offer late in the afternoon, he makes the following very philosophical rem

"It was probably not noon when he invoked the lengthening of the The sun had not yet passed the meridian of Gibeon, while over the we vale of Ajalon, the faint crescent of an old moon still lingered, *just as it ap to me*. Hence, standing between the two cities on the earth, he gave for miraculous command with the utmost accuracy, while from the wester came that fearful hail-storm driving up the valleys below, killing more had been slain by the sword; and from the eastern border of the othe dark storm-cloud was reflected the light of the motionless sun and moo p. 282.

But the pious skill and true Christian meekness and charity whic author everywhere assumes, though of course only by implication somewhat inconsistent with the language which he applies to so the natives. It is evident from his own account that, when the made any demonstration against our author and his fellow-trave they meant little, if anything more, than to frighten them. Ye terms, "villainous," "ruffian," murderers," &c., &c., are freely ap to them in the sanctimonious work before us. But let us allow Newman to speak for himself:

"Having seen us from their mountain fastnesses, the robbers rapidly co gated around the old stone tower, where, at the moment, we were readin inspired story of the place, and recording those reflections suggested b hour.

* iii. 3. 4.

"Such another band of *villainous*-looking men Nature has scarcely ever suffered to dwell upon the earth. Some were without a nose, others without an eye, while all bore scars of previous fights, and wore a vicious countenance which *promised* us no good. Each *ruffian* was armed with a long gun and a missile not unlike an Indian tomahawk. One, more reckless than the rest, *began the fray* by plundering my saddle-bags; but, seeing with what determination I drew my revolver, he immediately desisted. Wishing, if possible, to avoid another collision, we attempted to cross a corn-field to the hill on which Shiloh's ruins lay scattered, *but they seized us and drove us back*. Knowing that every moment's delay diminished our chances of escape, we concluded to resume our journey—peaceably if possible, but forcibly if we must. But we had no sooner mounted our horses than the brigands seized the bridles and demanded our money. Another exhibition of our well-conditioned revolvers—which by them is a dreaded weapon—again saved us from their hands, and, putting spurs to our horses, we descended a narrow valley on the south of Shiloh, keeping an eye upon the robbers, who were after us at full speed. But the bottom of the valley soon became so rough that it was impossible to proceed faster than a walk. Having overtaken us, they still *clamored* for money, and evinced their purpose to renew the attack. At that moment my horse stumbled, throwing me on his head; but, springing back into the saddle, and jerking the reins with all the strength *at my command*, I saved him from going down. My haversack, however, had fallen off, and one of the *ruffians*, having picked it up, refused to return it *without a reward*. Fortunately, the small amount I gave him *satisfied* him, *and to that man I owe my life*. Among the plants I had gathered at Shiloh was one of curious structure, which I desired to preserve. Its large bright green leaves were so folded as to resemble an embossed star, but it was a deadly poison. Having dropped it, I called to the Arab to pluck another, but he refused, assuring me in Arabic that it was poisonous." pp. 303–4.

Now, how much Christian charity is there in calling a man a robber, a ruffian, and a villain, who, he admits himself, *saved his life?* If the party were robbers, they were of a much more harmless kind than Christian robbers generally are. But the Doctor is not done with them yet.

"We now dismissed the peasant previously employed, giving him the promised sum. This proved our misfortune, as the robbers, becoming exasperated at the favor shown their neighbor, came upon us with renewed fierceness in a solitary mountain pass. They had the advantage in numbers, and *a base indifference to human life*. Sixteen against four gave us but little hope of successful resistance; but, unwilling to yield even against such odds, we determined to resist to the last. Rushing upon us with the utmost fury, they seized our bridles, and raising their tomahawks over our heads, demanded our money or our lives. Refusing to give the former, we resolved to protect the latter. Having never seen the countenance of a bandit in the act of violence, I shall never forget the expression of the ruffian who assailed me. His face was livid with rage, and his *solitary eye blazed with murderous intent* as he grasped the bridle firmly with one hand, and with the other raised the weapon of death over me. Undaunted either by his rage or threats, I held a parley with him for several minutes, he demanding, and I, in turn, refusing. Trying the power of religious fear, I pointed him to heaven, and repeated the sacred name of 'Allah,' but he smiled like a demon and fiercely replied, 'Give me your money!'

"Our firmness would have saved us from violence *had not a member of our party*, in an unguarded moment, *struck one of the brigands with a riding whip*, which precipitated the assault, and it was now baksheesh or death. Aware that by this act *we had become the aggressors*, we concluded to give each a few piastres. Happily for myself, I had not a piastre in change, but, borrowing half a one (two cents) from a companion, I gave it to the *villain*, whose fury had been cooled by firm looks, strong words, a Damascus blade, and a good revolver.

"Grouping together, they counted the spoils, but, finding the booty less than

they had expected, they attempted another pursuit, but we had eluded the grasp. Dashing down the glen, we reached in safety the small village o Lubban—the Lebonah of the Judges*, grateful to divine Providence tha through Arab cowardice and Christian grace, no blood had been shed."—pp 304—5.

Now does not this show, after all, that our pious travellers wer themselves the aggressors? It seems to us that if the Doctor is as valian as he would have us believe, and as skilful in the use of his revolver an "Damascus blade," he would be much more suitably and usefully occu pied in the army of the Potomac than in hunting up wonders from "Da to Beersheba," and compiling books like that before us.

Familiar Letters from Europe. By CORNELIUS CONWAY FELTON, lat President of Harvard University. 16mo. pp. 362. Boston: Tickno & Fields, 1864.

GENERALLY speaking it is those who promise most on their title-page tha give least, and *vice versa*. The latter is the case in the present instance we are promised but little, if anything, but we get a good deal that is a once interesting and instructive. The modesty of the title fairly repr sents that which pervades the whole volume; which thus presents wholesome contrast to most other works of the kind. None who kne the late President of Harvard need be informed that he was a man superior learning and culture. He was one of the best Greek scholars this country; but he did not on this account pretend that he knew tha language as well as his vernacular tongue, as some of the worst Gre scholars imagine they ought to do, because they occupy the Greek cha in some college or university. Prof. Felton did not hesitate to tell h friends at home and abroad that his principal object in visiting Gree was to study the Greek language both ancient and modern.

A professor far less acquainted with it would have thought such an a knowledgment derogatory to him. Nor need we go beyond Harva for an illustration of the fact. We have now before us a somewhat simi volume from a Harvard professor, in which there is a great deal abo Italy, but very little to the purpose, its chief characteristics being egotis arrogance, affectation and bad taste. The difference is this: one goes learn, the other goes to teach, or imagines he does. The former avails hi self of information and instruction wherever he finds it; the latter rar meets any but ignorant people. All he meets with have defects of so kind, from which he and his friends are entirely exempt. President Felto in search only of what is useful and interesting, and the results are such might have been expected from the design. Nor is he the less lively entertaining for being thus utilitarian, as we shall presently see. In glan ing over the pages of "Familiar Letters," the first passage that attrac our attention is one in which the author gives an account of an intervie

*Judges, xxi. 19.

he had with the King and Queen of Greece. Passing over the introductory part, we enter *in medias res*, as follows:

After some words of salutation, (you know the person presented—like a ghost—never speaks until he is spoken to,) the Queen asked, "Have you been long in Greece?"

"About three months, your Majesty."

King. "You are occupied with the study of the Greek language?"

"Yes, your Majesty."

"With the modern as well as the ancient?"

"Yes, your Majesty, that is the principal object of my travels in Greece."

"The pronunciation of the Greek is very different in America and England from the pronunciation here."

"Yes, your Majesty, so different that the Greek seems like two languages."

Queen. "How many students have you in the University of Cambridge?"

"Exactly the same number, your Majesty, as are now in the University of Athens."

Queen. "The same number? But you have many universities in America."

"Yes, we have many."

King. "What are the principal subjects or branches studied in the American universities?"

"The general studies, your Majesty, are the Classics, the Mathematics, Physics, Philosophy."

King. "Which of the professions attracts most of the young men?"

"The law, I think, since that is the profession which opens a political career."

King. "In Greece the study of Medicine and Theology are favorite studies."

"Yes,—the Greek physicians have always been very distinguished."

"In what departments do your writers excel?"

"Your Majesty, we have many writers in various departments. We have poets," (I thought of asking, if he had ever heard of Longfellow), "we have historians, &c."

"Are the sciences much cultivated?"

"They are,—especially the natural sciences. Since Professor Agassiz has resided in the United States, he has given an extraordinary impulse to the department, and excited an ardent scientific spirit."—pp. 337-38.

There is no affectation of superior learning in this; still less is there any attempt at that sort of wit which consists in mutilating one's vernacular tongue. But we can easily find much better passages in the volume before us than that just quoted. His descriptions of some of the classic scenes in and around Athens are among the best we have seen; none acquainted with the masterpieces of Greek literature in poetry or prose, such as the following. After giving a lively account of his arrival at the quarantine of Athens, the author proceeds to remark:

"At length the moment of release arrived. We scrambled down to a boat which Miltiades had already engaged for us; rowed ashore, stepped into a hack —O contradiction to all classical experience!—and were driven by a coachman over the Peiraic road, between the ruins of the walls of Themistocles, up to the city of Athens. We passed the olive-groves of Plato's Academy; dashed up to the Temple of Theseus, dismounted, and went through it; climbed the Areopagus, where Orestes was tried and Paul preached; looked over the Forum to the Pnyx, and the Bema whence Demosthenes harangued the Athenians; climbed up to the Propylæa; mounted the marble staircase leading into the Acropolis; went through and round the Parthenon; examined the piles of sculptured marbles still remaining on the ground; admired the Erechtheium; looked round upon the matchless panorama of marble mountains that encircle the plain; descended, stopping at the newly found temple of the Wingless Victory on the way; walked along the southern slope, surveying

the ruins of the Odeion and the site of the Dionysiac Theatre; jumped into an degenerate hack and drove to the still standing columns that form a part of the gigantic temple of Olympian Zeus; passed under the Arch of Hadrian; drove to the Temple of the Winds in the street of Æolus; then to bring the journey to a quite modern termination, dropped my luggage at the Hotel d'Angleterre."—pp. 212-3.

Some pages further on, the author gives us an agreeable insight into his mode of life at Athens, at the same time giving us an idea of the present state of education in Greece:

"I believe I have not yet given you an account of my manner of life here among the Athenians. Well, there are only two good streets in Athens: one is Hermes Street, where the King lives, and the other is the street of Æolus, where I live. I have taken a room in the Hotel d'Angleterre, which looks first upon an enclosed garden where the birds sing every morning; then towards the left on Lycabettus, a mountain that overhangs the city; and, finally, on nearly the whole range of Hymettus, where the bees make their honey, as in the time of Plato. I see the sun rise over Hymettus every morning, and at evening he casts his last beams directly on the garden beneath me. My room is quiet, but not far from the hotel is a soldiers' barrack, and I have almost every day the benefit of a lesson in Greek by listening to the words of command, in the drill. A young Greek teacher who speaks French very imperfectly, and no other language at all except Greek comes to me at seven o'clock in the morning, and spends about an hour and a half. At nine I go to the University, and hear a lecture on ancient Greece by Professor Asopios,—an old and very learned gentleman, whose language is not only elegant, but lively and eloquent. He speaks too rapidly for me to follow him, but I understand a considerable part of what he says, and daily understand more. Then I generally study three or four hours, reading and writing the best modern Greek I can. I have attended only one debate in the legislature, but the new session is to be opened to-morrow, and I shall try to be present, and to attend often afterwards."—pp. 234-35.

We are too apt to believe that the Greeks of the present day are an ignorant and benighted people, who have scarcely intelligence enough to be aware of the illustrious origin from which they have sprung. Prof. Felton gives no countenance to representations of this kind; but on the contrary shows that even the country boys coming to the city to earn an humble livelihood are intelligent and thoughtful. While passing through one of the principal streets, absorbed in thought, and contrasting the present with the past, the professor meets a boy, whom he describes thus:

"And as I mused, a ragged but bright-looking boy came up, and spoke to me. I entered into conversation with him. He told me, in excellent Greek, that he came from Chalcis, beyond the mountains; his father died two years ago; his mother was still alive. I asked what he was doing in Athens. He waited and did errands in a coffee-house. Wishing to try him a little further I pointed to the Temple of Theseus, and asked him what it was. He answered, in as good Greek as Xenophon would have used, 'The Temple of Theseus.' I pointed to the dungeon of Socrates. Said he, 'The prison of Socrates.' 'Who was Socrates?' said I. 'The ancient philosopher,' was the instant reply. This again was odd, though of course perfectly natural that this little Chalcidian ragamuffin should converse in Greek with so much greater facility than I could, using only a single word that was not classical—and that was *coffee-house*—in the course of fifteen or twenty minutes."—pp. 216-17.

How many of our common school boys, coming from some adjoining county to New York, would give a more intelligent account than this?

our city, modern as it is? Are not the number who could do so in excellent or even tolerable English, still fewer? But as we alluded to the other Harvard professor, let us now give a specimen of his style, so that the reader may institute a comparison and judge for himself, whether we are right or wrong. Prof. Bombastes can hardly pen the briefest paragraph without introducing foreign words of whose signification he has evidently but a very vague idea. To him the commonest and stalest occurrence seems something wonderful; what everybody that knows anything of Italy is tired of hearing, he notes as some great discovery. Thus, for example, what is there in the following characteristic passage which is new to any of our readers, except the bad English and slang dialect in which it is written?

"Do you take us for *Inglesi?* We are very well here, and will stay at the Sibilla," he sniffed scornfully.

"How much will Lordship give?" (This was showing the white feather.)

"Fifteen pauls," (a scudo and a half,) "*buonamano* included."

"It is impossible, gentlemen; for less than two scudi and a half the diligence parts not from Tivoli at an extraordinary hour."

"Fifteen pauls."

"Will Lordship give two scudi?" (with a slight flavor of mendicancy.)

"Fifteen pauls," (growing firm as we saw them waver.)

"Then, gentlemen, it is all over; it is impossible, gentlemen."

"Very good; a pleasant evening to you!" and they bowed themselves out.

As soon as the door closed behind them, Leopoldo, who had looked on in more and more anxious silence as the chance of plunder was *whittled slimmer and slimmer by the sharp edges of the parley*, saw instantly that it was for his interest to turn state's evidence against his accomplices.

"They will be back in a moment," he said knowingly, as if he had been of our side all along.

"Of course we are aware of that." It is always prudent to be aware of everything in travelling.

And, sure enough, in five minutes re-enter the stout men, as gravely as if everything had been thoroughly settled, and ask respectfully at what hour we would have the diligence.

Even the Italian diligence drivers (*Vetturini*) could hardly speak a worse dialect, or use more vulgar slang than the expression we have italicized. Had this professor gone to Athens, he would have found the Chalcidian boy a very stupid person. Thus it is that we learn by contrast to appreciate the good at its proper value, and to assign to the bad or spurious its proper level. We had marked several passages in Prof. Felton's letters from Italy, Germany, and France—especially in those from Florence and Venice, intending to extract at least a portion; but we now find that we can only refer the reader to the book itself, with the assurance that it will be his own fault if he does not derive profit and pleasure from its perusal.

FICTION.

John Godfrey's Fortunes: Related by himself. A Story of American Life. 12mo. pp. 511. New York: George P. Putnam: Hurd & Houghton, 1864.

We have taken up this work with the sincere intention of saying all

we could in its favor, for we had promised a particular friend to do so, and there is no reason, of which we are aware, why we should feel otherwise towards the author than well disposed. But after a careful perusal —which was no slight task—we cannot point to a single passage that has served us as an oasis in our dreary journey. When "Hannah Thurston" was published we occupied two days reading it, with the intention of reviewing it; but finding that we could say nothing agreeable of it we laid it aside, preferring to sacrifice so much time and labor rather than say unpleasant things. The author, we thought, will do better the next time; this is his first attempt at novel writing, and although we find in it none of the qualities that are supposed to be essential to such prose fiction as men or women of taste admire, the next may be different. So it is different; but the difference is for the worse, if possible. In glancing over the five hundred and eleven formidable pages that lie before us, we are instinctively reminded of the opening lines of the first Satire of Persius, in which the poet exclaims "How much vanity there is in human affairs! Who will read this? Nobody, by Hercules! It is mean and pitiful stuff!"—

> "O quantum est in rebus inane!
> Quis leget hæc? Miri tu istud ais? Nemo hercule!—Nemo?"
> Vel duo vel nemo. *Turpe miserable.*

But were we to accept the author's own estimate, we should regard it as the greatest of modern performances. Don Quixote, The Sorrows of Werther, and Ivanhoe would be dull and insipid compared to "John Godfrey's Fortunes." Nor would even this estimate be too high if the work contained as much humor and wit as it does egotism and vanity. The latter abound everywhere, beginning at the title-page, where we find the announcement, "The English copyright and foreign translation reserved by the Author." On the next leaf we have a dedication, "To James Lorimer Graham, Jr., Esq.," which opens with the following characteristic paragraph:

> "MY DEAR GRAHAM—I owe it to your kindness that the mechanical labor of putting this work into words has been so greatly reduced as almost to become a pleasure. Hence you were much in my thoughts while I wrote, and I do not ask your permission to associate your name with the completed work."

How handsome! Mr. Graham may well be proud of having furnished inspiration for such a work. As to what the paragraph means besides we do not pretend to understand, except it be that our author adopted the precaution of having his performance insured "against the dangers of the sea." If the proper interpretation is that Mr. Graham has insured the work against failure, we fear his "policy" will prove a dear one.

Our author next proceeds to inform his Mæcenas that "those persons who insist" that he made himself the hero of "Hannah Thurston," and who "will not fail to recognise him also in John Godfrey," are entirely mistaken. He would have us believe that everybody is very

much concerned about these matters; but we can assure him that none are, except perhaps a few very silly people. If it were of the least consequence who John Godfrey may be intended to represent, we think it would be pretty generally agreed among all who know our author, that he is the great man. John Godfrey was a genius from his cradle; even the old women in the village where he was born, and in every other village or place where he spent any part, however brief, of his life, knew that he was destined to become a great author, both in poetry and prose. All save the most stupid knew also that he would one day be connected editorially with the greatest paper on this continent; while the wiser class penetrated so far into the future as to be able to predict that in a short time he would become too illustrious a personage for a paper, and would therefore retire therefrom, so that he might instruct and reform the world with his books. In short, John Godfrey is just such a genius as Juvenal describes to us in his seventh satire, when he tells us that he wrote poetry as well as prose, and allowed himself to be surpassed by Homer only because the latter had written some two thousand years before him:

> Ipse facit versus, atque uni cedit Homero
> Propter mille annos.

In other words, John Godfrey is just the sort of person whom we should expect to write a "Poet's Journal," and, boy-like, whine therein about his private affairs, and fancy he became immortal, while he only subjected himself to the ridicule of every reader of taste or judgment. This, perhaps, our author would not do; if Mr. Taylor is too modest and retiring to glorify himself, or has too much good taste and sense of propriety to exhibit his lady-friends to vulgar gaze, bearing in mind that there is a modesty in nature which causes woman to blush, even "at her own loveliness," then we may admit that there is one feature in the character of the hero which does not belong to that of the author.

But let us see what is the object of the work before us, if it has any. We are introduced to the hero in the very first chapter, where we find him a child, but wise enough to be a grandfather. An old woman pays a visit to his mother, and talks and acts more absurdly than most old women do. In the next chapter our hero goes to a boarding-school, an event which furnishes material for fifteen pages of the most commonplace twaddle. To tell how the hero "begins to look forward," in the third chapter, requires twelve pages; but without giving us a single idea further than to remind us that, blessed are they that expect nothing from John Godfrey, for they shall not be disappointed. At page 33, he begins to write "compositions," and soon astonishes the whole school. A few pages further on, the boys begin to converse like philosophers of a certain school; and afford our author an opportunity of giving us a specimen of his powers in the portraiture of character. Speaking of a boy left in charge of the rest, while the teacher was out, he says: "He knit his brows

and tried to look very severe; but it was a pitiful sham which deceiv nobody. Thornton, who had been *dodging about* and whispering amo his accomplices, immediately imitated poor Walton's expression. T corrugation of his brows was something preternatural" (p. 40).

We have to wade through forty-eight pages before we meet with a thing which we could call an incident; even then all we are startled w is the fall of a lot of chairs in the cellar, while some of the boys are search of pies! It is deemed sufficient, however, to encourage us to proce quite a distance through the dreary waste. The next incident is t death of the hero's mother, by cancer, which occurs at page 74. The is another, however, in the next chapter, that is, our hero discovers a lative among his fellow pupils. True, this is not a very uncommon thin it is equally true that it leads to no very important results in this ca The discovery is made known to us as follows:

"The other boys, of course, noticed the difference in our relations, and was not long before the inquisitive Thornton said,

"'I say, Pen, how is it that you've got to calling Godfrey 'John' all once?'

"'Because he is my cousin.'

"Thornton's eyes opened very wide. 'The devil he is!' he exclaime &c.—p. 88.

At page 86 our hero leaves school and becomes a clerk to his uncle, grocer. So brilliant a light could not be concealed under a bushel, ev in so small a town as Reading, Pa., and accordingly our hero soon begi to attract attention. The future editor, poet, and novelist, had of cou no taste for groceries, so he quarrels with his benighted uncle and resol to become a school teacher. "A Story of American Life" would not complete without a "revival," and accordingly we are treated to one quite a large scale. In describing one of the revival scenes, our auth makes use of some of his fine idioms, as follows: "Others were weepi or groaning in their seats, but still *hung back* from the step which *p claimed them confessed sinners*, seeking for mercy" (p. 115).

John Godfrey had only to present himself to a school officer at a nei boring village, in order to get employment as a teacher. His first care to fall in love with that officer's daughter, the beautiful, amiable, and complished Miss Amanda Bratton. We are told that she performed the piano with great skill, thus:

"She turned to her keys again, and, after a short prelude, played the Drui March from Norma, boldly, *and with a strongly accented rhythm*. I was astonis at the delicacy of her ear, for I should not have known but that the instrum was in very good tune."—p. 142.

The school-teaching experience of Godfrey is as dull and dreary all that precedes it. What we are expected to admire in it are delicate attentions to Amanda, the charming manner in which she ceives them, and the effect all has in developing his genius for poetry romance. In due time he sends poetical contributions to a Philadelp

editor, who accepts them eagerly. Then we are told that "the tidings that the schoolmaster wrote verses were soon spread throughout the neighborhood" (p. 163). One after another began to tell him that Philadelphia or New York, especially the latter, was his place. It was not difficult to persuade him, and accordingly he was soon in New York. He contributes an article to a magazine, and it is duly published therein. Still, because editors, like other people, are sometimes stupid, he had the mortification to see his efforts rejected by more than one.

After some hesitation he applied to the editor of the *Daily Wonder*, who, seeing at a glance that he was a genius, gave him regular employment. He remains in the *Wonder* office until his fame as an author is established, meantime publishing a book of poetry, which is received with great favor by all competent judges. Before embarking fully in his career of book-writing, he goes to the country to see his beloved Amanda, whom he finds married to another. He reproaches her with her perfidy in no measured terms, and she replies in the following lady-like and gentle manner: "It is a lie!" she exclaimed. "How dare you say such things? I never was engaged to you—I never told you that I loved you" (p. 237). He mustered courage enough to strike her husband for some taunting remarks he had made. Then we are told, "His wife screamed, and seemed to be making towards him, her *quiet eyes lighted up horridly with a white, steely blaze*" (p. 238).

He returns to New York, and dines with the editor of the *Daily Wonder*. Soon after he becomes a philanthropist, and makes incursions into the back alleys in order to ameliorate the condition of sentimental sewing girls. About the same time he becomes acquainted with Miss Haworth, who is to be regarded as heroine No. 2. In comparing her with a married lady of her acquaintance, he says: "for I did not think the latter (Miss H.) old enough *for marked development*" (p. 333). Of course the lady admires his poetry, as who would not? and in a short time becomes tenderly attached to him. An estrangement takes place, the cause of which it would be too tedious to explain, but Jane Berry, a sewing girl of Gooseberry Alley, who had been "ruined" a short time previously by a certain treacherous person, resolved to vindicate our hero, for she could not bear to see injustice done to so generous a benefactor. She visits Miss Haworth and explains to her every suspicious circumstance, not forgetting to tell her at the same time how she herself had been ruined. Isabel (Miss Haworth) takes a great liking to Jane, and permits herself to be persuaded by her to become reconciled to Godfrey, whom she marries soon after. He is so grateful for this and other kindnesses that he recommends her as a suitable wife to his former schoolmate and friend.

But enough; our task is finished; one of the most disagreeable we have had to perform in a long time. We do not think the book will do any harm; but we feel certain it will do no good. It is

really too puerile and feeble to produce any appreciable effect one way or the other. It is no pleasure to us to pass this judgment upon it. On the contrary, we should much rather speak in the opposite sense; for we have bestowed as high praise on some of Mr. Taylor's books of travel, as we have on almost any other works of a similar character. We have criticised him only as a novel writer and poet; and we have done so only because we think he has no just claim to the character of one or the other.

BELLES-LETTRES.

Poems. By DAVID GRAY; *with Memoirs of his Life.* 16*mo. pp.* 288. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1864.

WE have seldom taken up a volume of equal size, bearing a similar title, that has interested us so much as this. There is a fascination about it which the merit of the poetry alone, although of no mean order, will not account for. Nor is it sufficient to remember that the author died a mere youth. Many have written verses, and died as early as he, without leaving any impression beyond the circle of their immediate friends; nay, other young men have written as good poetry as David Gray, and gone to their untimely graves without the honor of memoir or epitaph. Yet he is worthy of the distinction conferred on him; he has earned it with all the industry and perseverance of one who yearns for excellence. Neither Keats, nor Kirke White, nor any other young poet, made so hard a struggle as he to inscribe his name on the roll of fame. Although we are bound to judge his poetry as we find it, we cannot help giving him more or less credit for his extraordinary efforts. This will be the feeling of every one capable of a generous emotion who reads this strange volume. The author had striking peculiarities. They are not, indeed, all such as the world would approve, as we shall presently see; although there are none of them which could not be easily forgiven even in one far less gifted than he, or less capable of making amends for his errors.

But in order to understand this it will be necessary to take a brief glance at the prominent features of his life and character. The Introductory Notice by Lord Houghton (R. Monckton Milnes, M. P.) and the Memoir by Mr. James Hedderwick, render this part of our task an easy one; and none should read a word of the poetry until they have carefully perused the narratives of both these gentlemen. David Gray was born in 1838, on the banks of the Luggie some eight miles distant from the city of Glasgow. Although his father was but a poor hand-loom weaver, who had a large family to support by his industry, he succeeded in securing for David the advantages of a classical education. The latter became conscious at an early age that he possessed genius. None capable of judging, who read his poems carefully, will be

deny him at least a certain portion of that high gift. istake of its possessor was, that he was destined to rorld's greatest thinkers. To no poets less illustrious lime than Shakespeare and Goethe would he compare ough sometimes when chided for this he would express fied to be ranked with Wordsworth. Thus, for example, he . Dobell, the poet: "I tell you that if I live my name and a second to few of any age and to none of my own. I speak I *feel* power. Nor is this feeling an artificial disease, as it sseau, but a feeling which has grown with me since ever I " (p. 80.) Judging from the tone of a subsequent letter gentleman, it is evident that he had received some wholesome st vanity and egotism; he is now somewhat subdued in ns; but it will be seen that he still soars pretty high "In all the stories," he says, "of mental warfare that read, that mind which became of celestial clearness and god- did nothing for twenty years but *feel*. And I am so accus- mpare my own mental progress *with that of such men* re, *Goethe, and Wordsworth*, (examples of this last proposition,) n of my youth *will not be fulfilled if my fame equal not at least tter of these three*." (p. 82.)

ing his estimate of his own powers, it is not to be that he would not be content on the banks of the Luggie, a admired its scenery; nor in any field of rivalry less or less great than the British capital. The rest of soon told. That he was treated generously and well by and women is very clear; but all thought, while fully appreci- erior talents, that he had acted unwisely in coming to Lon- sue showed that their opinion was but too true. The pov- h he was reduced in a short time after coming to London, a unable to protect his delicate frame from the cold of winter. him to contract a severe cold, which in time brought on con- l death. The gentlemen already alluded to, generously aided r friends, did all in their power, not only to alleviate his suffer- possible to save him from an early grave. But all to no . the 2d of December, 1861, he received a kind letter from Mrs. s, the author of "Ethel," enclosing him a specimen page of This afforded him great delight. Now he felt that he could y, and accordingly only lived until the next day. This gives lea of the sad story of David Gray; yet it will somewhat aid a forming an opinion of his poems from the brief specimens an make room for.

cipal poem in the present collection is entitled *The Luggie*, a small stream which flows into the Kelvin, one of the tributa-

ries of the Clyde. The scenery on its banks is, indeed, sufficiently pic esque; but there are not many, even of the children of song, who wo have chosen as a subject what is nothing more than a mere rivulet. Wha called a creek in America is often larger than both the Luggie and Kelvin. The title has, therefore, been injurious to the sale of the bo in England as well as in Scotland, because it is too apt to convey the id that the principal poem is devoted exclusively to the beauties of the riv This, however, would be a great mistake. Never have we found more varie in any piece of equal length. It is more like an autobiography than pastoral; although it contains as fine pastoral scenes and descriptions, so f as they go, as we have met with in any modern work, scarcely excepti the *Seasons* of Thomson. But there is scarcely an incident in his li which he considered of any moment, to which he does not allude in th poem.

If he goes to visit a young lady, with or without a friend, he te us all about it—how he tapped at the window, how the lady came to t door and opened it, how he kissed her for doing so, how long he remai ed, &c.—Nor is it alone his visits to his lady-love which are thus du chronicled in the poem; a visit to his grandfather is similarly disti guished. If a friend of his dies, he is duly described and mourned. Th we have a love-scene in one passage, a snow-storm in another, a sketch an old farmer in another, &c. The Luggie is, indeed, mentioned here a there, but generally like the refrain of a song; at certain times, however, inspires some really beautiful lines—nay, strains of genuine poetry, whi would have done honor to a much nobler subject.

To a reader of taste the inference from all this would be th our author has violated some of the most important literary pr cepts, since episodes of the kind alluded to are not admissible in pastoral poem which has no pretensions to a dramatic form. Su is the fact; he has set Horace, Longinus, and Boileau, as well the great Stagyrite, at defiance. But he has done so in so charming a ma ner that we readily forgive him; nay, there is hardly an irrelevant passa he has introduced which we could wish he had omitted, with the sc exception of his glorification of himself, and the too scrupulous care takes to remind us here and there of his tender age. Even in this the is a sort of naïveté which disarms criticism. But it is time that we low our author to speak for himself. We are introduced to the favor river as follows:

> "For fairer stream
> Rolled never golden sand unto the sea,
> Made sweeter music than the Luggie, gloomed
> By glens whose melody mingles with her own.
> The uttered name my inmost being thrills,
> A word beyond a charm; and if this lay
> Could smoothly flow along and wind to the end
> In natural manner as the Luggie winds
> Her tortuous waters, then the world would list
> In sweet enthralment, swallowed up and lost,
> As he who hears the music that beguiles."—p. 96.

In this there is nothing remarkable—it would not lead one to expect much—and yet there are good poems that have no more brilliant or more harmonious beginning. Passing over a page or so, we come to another strain, which is much better; still it scarcely gives us a foretaste of the inspiration which easily reveals itself as we proceed.

> "Beneath an ash in beauty tender leaved,
> And through whose boughs the glimmering sunshine flowed
> In rare ethereal jasper, making cool
> A checkered shadow in the dark green grass,
> I lay enchanted. At my head there bloomed
> A hedge of sweet-brier, fragrant as the breath
> Of maid beloved when her cheek is laid
> To yours in downy pressure, soft as sleep.
> A bank of harebells, flowers unspeakable
> For half-transparent azure, nodding, gleamed
> As a faint zephyr, laden with perfume,
> Kissed them to motion, gently, with no will."—p. 97.

Our next extract has several faults, but at the same time it is highly poetical. The author is describing a snow-storm—all we can give is a small fragment; nor can we say that this is the best part of the description:

> "Softly—with delicate softness—as the light
> Quickens in the undawned east; and silently—
> With definite silence—as the stealing dawn
> Dapples the floating clouds, slow fall, slow fall,
> With indecisive motion eddying down,
> The white-winged flakes,—calm as the sleep of sound,
> Dim as a dream. The silver-misted air
> Shines with mild radiance, as when through a cloud
> Of semi-lucent vapor shines the moon."—p. 101.

Turning over two or three pages, we find some lines which have seldom been surpassed in their kind:

> "Songless birds
> Flit restlessly about the breathless wood,
> Waiting the sudden breaking of the charm;
> And as they quickly spring on nimble wing
> From the white twig, a sparkling shower fal's
> Starlike. It is not whiteness, but a clear
> Outshining of all purity, which takes
> The winking eyes with such a silvery gleam.
> No sunshine, and the sky is all one cloud.
> The vale seems lonely, ghostlike; while aloud
> The housewife's voice is heard with double sound.
> I have not words to speak the perfect show."—p. 104.

We now come to the episodes alluded to above. Passing over the poet's visit to his Kate—which, however, we would not have our readers do—we come to the fine tribute which he pays to a deceased friend. There is true pathos as well as melody and sweetness in the following extract:

> "We sat at school together on one seat,
> Came home together through the lanes, and knew
> The dunnock's nest together in the hedge,
> With smooth blue eggs in cosey brightness warm.
> And as two youngling kine on cold Spring nights
> Lie close together on the bleak hillside
> For mutual heat, so when a trouble came
> We crept to one another, growing still
> True friends in interchange of heart and soul.
> But suddenly death changed his countenance,
> And graved him in the darkness far from me.
> O Friendship, prelibation of divine
> Enjoyment, union exquisite of soul,
> How many blessings do I owe to thee,
> How much of incommunicable woe!

The daisies bloom among the tall green blades
Upon his grave, and listening you may hear
The Bothlin make sweet music as she flows;
And you may see the poplars by her brink
Twinkle her silvery leaflets in the sun.
O little wandering preacher, Bothlin brook!
Wind musically by his lonely grave."—pp. 123-4.

One of the finest descriptions of a well it has ever been our privilege to see and admire, is the following:

"In a fair valley, carpeted with turf
Elastic, sloping upwards from the stream,
A rounded sycamore in honeyed leaves
Most plenteous, murmurous with humming bees,
Shadows a well. Darkly the crystal wave
Gleams cold, secluded; on its polished breast
Imagining twining boughs. No pitcher breaks
Its natural sleep, except at morn and eve
When my good mother through the dewy grass
Walks patient with her vessels, bringing home
The clear refreshment. Every blowing Spring,
A snowdrop with pure streaks of delicate green
Upon its inmost leaves, from withered grass
Springs whitely, and within its limpid breast
Is mirrored whitely. Not a finger plucks
This hidden beauty; but it blooms and dies,
In lonely lustre blooms and lonely dies,—
Unknown, unloved, save by one simple heart
Poetic, the creator of this song."—pp. 136-7.

The allusion to the author in the last line might seem rather egotistic if he were still alive. Even then, who would not forgive a worse fault, in consideration of the beauty and tenderness of what precedes it? Yet still more poetical, if possible, is the description of the robin's nest by which it is immediately followed, and which is the last extract we can give from *The Luggie:*

"And after this frail luxury hath given
Its little life in keeping to the soul
Of all the worlds, a robin builds its nest
In lowly cleft, a foot or so above
The water. His dried leaves, and moss, and grass
He hither carries, lining all with hair
For softness. I have laid the hand that writes
These lines beloved, on the crimson breast,
Sleek-soft, that panted o'er the five unborn;
While leaf-hid, o'er me sang the watchful mate
Plaintive, and with a sorrow in the song,
In sylvan nook, where anchoret might dwell
Contented."—p. 137.

We have no disposition to criticise a work in which there is so much genuine poetry, especially when we bear in mind that it is that of a youth who sacrificed his life to a passionate yearning for excellence. This he has not succeeded in attaining; no one ever did at his age; but that he has accomplished much none competent to judge will deny. Had he lived he would doubtless have avoided in future efforts the defects to which we have alluded; also certain forms of expression which sometimes mar his happiest strains. Thus, for example, he makes too frequent use of expressions like "is languaged" (p. 96), "the summered earth" (p. 134), &c. He is also rather prone to repeat the same words in succession, as "dear heart, dear heart," "of old, of old, &c." In the ballad style, or in such pieces as admit a refrain, this would be allowable, but not in so serious

and pathetic a poem as *The Luggie*. Yet it seems unkind to say so in the case of David Gray. The sad and eloquent strains which cost him his life, and from which we have derived genuine pleasure, seem to reproach us for uttering a single word of censure. We will say no more, therefore, but earnestly advise all who are capable of the tenderer emotions of humanity, to read the tasteful volume before us.

The Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson, 12mo., pp. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1864.

THERE are many striking passages in the Country Parson's new volume. It is a seasonable book, and we doubt not that it will be much read during the approaching festive season. Yet it is by no means what is generally understood by a religious book. Indeed, some parts of it are rather the reverse; at least they seem to us to be somewhat wanting in charity; a very essential Christian virtue—one without which religion is but a name. Thus, for example, in his chapter on "Gossip," the Country Parson remarks: "In a simple state of society, if you disliked a man, you would knock him on the head. *If an Irishman, you would shoot him from behind a hedge.*" This is representing an Irishman as both an assassin and a coward. But will his readers believe the Parson?

This is not the sort of character that Scott, or Campbell, or Smollet has given of Patrick with all his faults. But what of that? Country parsons, like other people, will say naughty things sometimes. Sterne, for example, has done so, although My Uncle Toby was too humane, as well as too wise, to agree with either Johnson or Churchill in their hatred of the Scotch. But let the volume before us be read; it will injure none and it will serve many. The chapter entitled "At the Castle: Michael Scott's Familiar Spirit," is in our author's best vein. Another good paper is that entitled "On the Forest Hill;" nor would we have the reader pass over the paper "About Scotch Affairs." This will be particularly attractive to those who take an interest in education.

The Works of JONATHAN SWIFT, D.D., *and Dean of St. Patrick's*, Dublin, with Copious Notes and Additions, and a Memoir of the Author, by THOMAS ROSCOE. Complete in six volumes. New York: P. O'Shea.

ALL who admire the wit and wisdom of the great Dean, should thank the American publisher for this complete and elegant edition of his works. We need only speak of the mechanical part, the convenience of the volumes, the clearness and neatness of the typography, the good quality of the paper, and the tastefulness combined with strength of the binding. Our readers require no criticisms on the writings of Swift to give them an idea of their character. It were a superfluous task indeed to attempt to describe Gulliver's Travels, for who has not read at some period of his life that strange but inimitable performance? Yet scarce-

ly less unique, or less characteristic of the author, is The Battle of the Books, or A Tale of a Tub, not to mention the celebrated Drapier's Letters, Advice to Servants, Modest Proposal, &c. The Life of Swift by Roscoe, prefixed to the present edition, omits nothing worthy of record. Its value is also not a little enhanced by the Journal to Stella, which appears entire in the third volume. Irishmen especially should appreciate the enterprise of Mr. O'Shea; for with all his faults Swift was one of Ireland's best friends. Are there not a large number in this country of the posterity of those Catholics and Protestants, who, forgetting for the time being, all sectarian differences, joined together like brethren as they should always be, and carried the author of the Drapier's Letters in triumph through the city of Dublin, after he had driven Wood's half-pence out of circulation by the magic of his pen, while a large reward was offered for the discovery of the writer who was capable of such logic?

The Seer; or, Common Places Refreshed. By LEIGH HUNT. In two volumes, 16mo., pp. 334, 290. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1864.

THE numerous American admirers of Leigh Hunt may well thank the publishers for their enterprise and taste in getting up this beautiful edition of his most attractive essays. In their present graceful form there are but few works we would recommend before them for the approaching holidays. They consist chiefly of contributions made at different time to some of the principal periodicals of London; they embrace a wid range, and may fairly be ranked among the best specimens of moder essays—not a few of them being worthy of comparison with the bes similar efforts of Addison and Steele.

Reflections and Meditations selected from the Writings of Fenelon; wit A Memoir of his Life. By J. R. G. HASSARD, ESQ., and an Introduction by REV. THOMAS S. PRESTON. 12mo. pp. 374. New York P. O'Shea, 1864.

THE selections from the writings of Fenelon given in this volume ar much more attractive to the general reader than one would expect fro its title. To the minds of most persons, the latter is more suggestive o sermons and other religious discourses than of those fine philosophica discussions and brilliant, fascinating essays which have ranked the autho among the most illustrious of his age. It is, however, much mor creditable to furnish the reader more than he bargains for, than to excit expectations by an exaggerated title-page, which are not to be realized a fact which most of our book makers would do well to remember

Even Fenelon has scarcely written a more interesting essay—considered altogether independently of its religious character—than that "On th Existence of God," of which we have a faithful and elegant translatio in the volume before us. It is a philosophical discussion, enriched b facts and principles drawn from nature and art, all tending to the conclu

sion, which becomes more and more irresistible as it proceeds, that those who attribute the sublime harmony of the universe to blind chance, are themselves the blindest of mortals, however highly gifted they may be—however logically they may reason—in other respects. Those unacquainted with this essay will be able to form some idea of its value, if they bear in mind that Newton, Locke, Reaumur, Winslow, and Paley have each in turn availed themselves of Fenelon's unanswerable arguments in proof of the existence of God.

Two other admirable essays, contained in this volume, are those "Upon Fidelity in Little Things," and "On Simplicity." These deserve not only to be carefully read, but studied. Yet, perhaps, the most useful and valuable piece of all is that "On the Education of Girls." The best writers on the subject, from Fenelon's time to the present, have borrowed extensively from this, and have seemed most original when doing so, and most in accordance with what is called "the progressive spirit of the Nineteenth Century." In order to enable those who have not seen it an opportunity of forming some opinion of their own as to whether it is worthy of this distinction, we will extract a sentence or two, here and there, as specimens of the author's views, premising that he gives his opinion of women as well as girls.

How often have we been told within the last seven years that the idea of cultivating the mind of woman, so as to give it strength and firmness, is one of the many great discoveries of our own age? Yet nearly two centuries have passed since Fenelon wrote as follows: "Women, in general, have feebler minds than men; *the weaker the mind is the more important it is to fortify it*" (p. 179). We all know what is the common complaint against the sex. "It is ignorance," says Fenelon, "which renders women frivolous. When they have arrived at a certain age without habits of application, they cannot acquire a taste for it; whatever is serious appears to them *sad;* whatever demands continued attention fatigues them" (p. 180). Both parents and teachers would do well to ask themselves whether the following language is not as applicable to the girls of the present day, as it was to those of the middle of the seventeenth century: "They read books which nourish their vanity, and become passionately fond of romances, comedies, and fanciful adventures. Their minds become visionary," &c., (p. 181).

The teachers, who, machine like, do everything by rule, are thus addressed by the author of *Télémaque:* "Neither men nor children always resemble themselves. What is good to-day is dangerous to-morrow. A plan of conduct *that never varies, cannot be useful.* Forms should be used as little as possible in their lessons. We may impart instruction more useful than their lessons convey, by our conversation" (p. 189). Would that all who pretend to teach would understand this! If they did, there would not be one-tenth as many stunted minds as there are. "Little can be ex-

pected," says Fenelon, "from a woman who does not know how to express her thoughts with correctness, and *how to be silent*" (p. 189). Again he remarks: "Teach girls to say but little according to the occasion, and the person they address; let them be reminded that *finesse* always belongs to a mean heart and a weak mind; people are artful because they have something to conceal, and do not dare to appear what they are" (p. 199).

Snatched almost at random as these suggestions are, they are replete with wisdom, and applicable to all civilized countries. We should also remember that Fenelon was one of the few whose conduct through life is in strict accordance with what is most noble and elevating in their writings. He was always the friend of the oppressed, no matter whence the oppression came. His generous defence of Molière, when the great dramatist was assailed from all quarters, will serve as an illustration of this, although it were easy to find others that would present him in a still more manly and amiable light. When *Tartuffe* was proscribed throughout France as a covert attack on religion, Fenelon openly justified the author, maintaining, even against the authority of the Archbishop of Paris, that the tendency of the piece was to serve the cause of religon rather than injure it, by enabling the public to discriminate between genuine piety and mere hypocrisy. It was not merely in his letters and addresses that he thus lent his powerful aid to the struggling poet; he gave still more earnest expression to the same views in his *Télémaque*, by describing the hypocrite as the most dangerous of the wicked—worse than the children who strangle their parents, than the wives who imbrue their hands in the blood of their husbands, or than the traitors who betray their country after having violated their oaths.*

Gotten up as the present edition is, in creditable style, we have no doubt but it will be appreciated, if not as the intrinsic merit of the work deserves, at least to such an extent as to encourage the republication of what is valuable and good.

The Poems, Sacred, Passionate, and Humorous, of NATHANIEL PARKER WILLIS. 16mo., pp. 370. New York: Clark & Maynard, 1864.

IT is now more than twenty years since we read with much pleasure, on the other side of the Atlantic a neat volume, entitled "Melanie and other Poems, by N. P. Willis, edited by Barry Cornwall, published by

* "L' hypocrite," he says "est le plus dangereux des mechants, la fausse pieté étant cause que les hommes n'osent plus se fier à la veritable. Les hypocrites souzent dans les enfers des peines plus cruelles que les enfants qui ont égorgé leurs pères et leurs mères, que les épouses qui ont trempé leurs mains dans le sang de leurs èpoux, que les traitres qui ont livrés leur patrie après avoir violé tous leurs serments."

Saunders & Otley, London;" but we could never forget the book, if it were only on account of the many fair and amiable friends who sought to borrow it, and whose admiration of it might well have excited the jealousy even of their own national minstrel. We well remember how severely the author was criticised by the principal literary journals of Great Britain; but we also remember that this was occasioned much more by what he had previously said in his prose writings, than by any defects in his poetry; and yet it is but justice to the critics to say that those who were most bitter in their denunciations of the former admitted that the latter possessed genuine merit.

The preface of Barry Cornwall was another feature in the book, which was well calculated to impress the memory of any one who had any sympathy for America. Although we have not read his remarks for more than fifteen years, we think we can quote one or two with tolerable accuracy. Wishing to remove the strong prejudices then existing against almost everything American, especially against American literature and American culture, Barry addressed his countrymen as follows: "If we possess an advantage in some respects over America, by reason of our having had more opportunities of cultivating the mere elegancies of literature, yet in others our superiority is by no means evident." Many acknowledged the truth of this at the time; but Barry spoke much more plainly. "It is clear," he says, "that we have until lately done injustice to American writers. We have tested them by an unfair rule, and *have measured them by their weakness only*, and not by their strength." Again he observes of Willis: "This is not the place to speak of the author, even as he deserves. He would object to my eulogiums as flagrant and unmerited, and I should not be satisfied with administering him anything short of the praise due to him." Barry Cornwall was well aware that, in saying so much in favor of American literature, he was subjecting himself to severe strictures, but he was one of those who set a much higher value on truth and justice than on that spurious fame which a certain class of authors receive for being "genial"—that is, for praising everybody and everything they speak of, making little or no distinction between the genuine precious metal and its counterfeit imitation.

It may seem superfluous to review poems so well known to our readers as Willis's principal efforts; but be it remembered that it is now nearly, if not quite, thirty years since they were first published, and that there are those who were not then born that are now men and women of culture and taste, not to mention those who have yet to form their opinions of all authors. We must also bear in mind, that many new pieces of undoubted merit have been added to the old collection; nor must we overlook the fact, that there are few of us possessed of any warmth of feeling, who do not recur with pleasure, as we grow old, to what pleased us in our

youth. But the appearance of the new and tasteful edition lying befc us suggested yet another reason why it should be noticed.

However unpleasant the reflection may be, the general style of A literature, far from having improved since these Poems were first p lished, has decidedly degenerated. Excellent works have, indeed, b published in the meantime; works which would do credit to any lit ture; such, for example, as those of Irving, Prescott, Cooper, Longfell Bryant, Hawthorne, Ticknor, and perhaps one or two others. But a what is the character of the rest? Are not its chief characteristics sla coarseness, superficialness, vulgarity? How many of our writers seem think that all that is required is to become "popular;" that thought and flection may be thrown aside as useless lumber; that they may ignore t experience and wisdom of the past, and concern themselves exclusive with the present and the future. Nor do many of those who wish to regarded as poets form any exception to the rule; but on the contra there are those amongst the most pretentious and ambitious, who wou have wit and humor consist in outraging their mother tongue, th realizing the language of the French Horace written, two centuries ag

> "On ne vit plus en vers que pointes triviales
> Le Parnasse parla le langage des *halles*.*

There is nothing vulgar in the language of Willis. Could we rega him as a fair specimen, in this respect, of the alumni of old Yale, we shou entertain a much higher opinion of that institution than we do. But is time that we should allow our author to present his own claims to high rank among the minstrels of his country, as the fruit rep sents the character of the tree which produced it. In this department our journal, we could not make room for such copious extracts as wo enable us to illustrate our impressions of efforts so different from e other as many of his miscellaneous poems. All we can undertake, on present occasion, is to take a hurried glance at the new volume, and tract such brief passages as seem best calculated to serve as specimens the poems from which they are taken. We pass over the Sacred Poe not because we do not admire them, for we think they have scarcely b surpassed even by the best similar efforts of Montgomery, but because always prefer to leave religious subjects, even when they assume the be tiful form of true poetry, in the hands of those who have made them study of their lives. We much prefer to give our opinion of poems, example, like the "Dying Alchymist." There is great vigor of thou in this. The true character of the ancient alchemist, so much despised the present day by the thoughtless and idle, is well conceived and fir

* Art Poétique.

described. Wishing to give as much variety as possible, we are obliged to content ourselves with a small fragment of the opening description:

> The fire beneath his crucible was low;
> Yet still it burn'd; and ever as his thoughts
> Grew insupportable, he raised himself
> Upon his wasted arm, and stirr'd the coals
> With difficult energy, and when the rod
> Fell from his nerveless fingers, and his eye
> Felt faint within its socket, he shrunk back
> Upon his pallet, and with unclosed lips
> Mutter'd a curse on death! The silent room,
> From its dim corners, mockingly gave back
> His rattling breath—p. 119.

The dying votary of science takes a draught from a phial kept beneath his pillow, and, having thus acquired supernatural strength, soliloquizes as follows:

> I did not think to die
> *Till I had finished what I had to do;*
> *I thought to pierce th' eternal secret through*
> *With this my mortal eye;*
> I felt—oh God! it seemeth even now
> This cannot be the death-dew on my brow!
>
> And yet it is—I feel,
> Of this dull sickness at my heart, afraid!
> And in my eyes the death-sparks flash and fade;
> And something seems to steal
> Over my bosom like a frozen hand—
> Binding its pulses with an icy band.—p. 120.

This is highly characteristic of the alchemist, especially what we have marked in italics. He continues, in an elevated strain, to philosophize on death, but we can only avail ourselves of a stanza here and there. The ardor with which he clings even in death to the grand object of his life, is strikingly illustrated in the following stanzas:

> Grant me another year,
> God of my spirit!—but a day—to win
> Something to satisfy this thirst within!
> I would *know* something here!
> Break for me but one seal that is unbroken!
> Speak for me but one word that is unspoken!
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Ay—were not man to die,
> He were too mighty for this narrow sphere!
> Had he but time to brood on knowledge here—
> Could he but train his eye—
> Might he but wait the mystic word and hour—
> Only his Maker would transcend his power!
>
> Earth has no mineral strange—
> Th' illimitable air no hidden wings—
> Water no quality in covert springs,
> And fire no power to change—
> Seasons no mystery, and stars no spell,
> Which the unwasting soul might not compel.—p. 121.

Of a somewhat similar character is the poem entitled "Parrhasius," the name of an Athenian painter who bought a captive old man from Philip of Macedon, for the purpose of putting him to death by torture, so that he might be the better able to express the pains and passions of his Prome-

theus. The poet fully awakens and secures the sympathy of the re follows:

> There stood an unsold captive in the mart,
> A gray-haired and majestical old man,
> Chain'd to a pillar. It was almost night,
> And the last seller from his place had gone,
> And not a sound was heard but of a dog
> Crunching beneath the stall a refuse bone,
> Or the dull echo from the pavement rung,
> As the faint captive changed his weary feet.
> He had stood there since morning, and had borne
> From every eye in Athens the cold gaze
> Of curious scorn. The Jew had taunted him
> For an Olynthian slave. The buyer came
> And roughly struck his palm upon his breast,
> And touch'd his unheal'd wounds, and with a sneer
> Pass'd on; and when, with weariness o'erspent,
> He bow'd his head in a forgetful sleep,
> Th' inhuman soldier smote him, and, with threats
> Of torture to his children, summon'd back
> The ebbing blood into his pallid face.—p. 123.

After all other buyers have left, the painter stays "to gaze u grief," and draw inspiration from his sufferings. This repres enthusiasm of art in its darkest shade, but we cannot deny the t ness of the picture, startling as it is:

> The abandon'd limbs,
> Stained with the oozing blood, were laced with veins
> Swollen to purple fulness; the grey hair,
> Thin and disorder'd, hung about his eyes;
> And as a thought of wilder bitterness
> Rose in his memory, his lips grew white,
> And the fast workings of his bloodless face
> Told what a tooth of fire was at his heart. —p. 125

Still darker is the picture drawn after the captive is brough artist's studio, where every instrument of torture awaits him in th of strong and ruthless men, who are not a whit the less cruel they are slaves themselves. The different gradations of suffering which he passes are described with painful vividness; but we make room for two stanzas:

> "Ha! bind him on his back!
> Look!—as Prometheus in my picture here!
> Quick—or he faints! stand with the cordial near!
> Now—bend him to the rack!
> Press down the poison'd links into his flesh!
> And tear agape that healing wound afresh!
>
> "So—let him writhe! How long
> Will he live thus? Quick, my good pencil, now!
> What a fine agony works upon his brow!
> Ha! grey-hair'd, and so strong!
> How fearfully he stifles that short moan!
> Gods! if I could but paint a dying groan!"—pp. 126-27.

It is pleasant to turn from these scenes, powerfully depicted as t to "Melanie." In this too, our sympathies are strongly exci the heart is softened, not lacerated, by those fine touches of path found at every page in the latter poem. The story is pecul catastrophe is sad; all the more so because unexpected. An imp girl discovers at the altar that her lover is her brother, and die

however, is but the gloomy side. Throughout the poem we meet passages that are exquisitely beautiful. Instance the following description, which we snatch almost at random:

Yet, gaily o'er Egeria's fount
The ivy flings its emerald veil,
And flowers grow fair on Numa's mount,
And light-sprung arches span the dale;
And soft, from Caracalla's baths,
The herdsman's song comes down the breeze,
While climb his goats the giddy paths
To grass-grown architrave and frieze;
And gracefully Albano's hill
Curves into the horizon's line;
And sweetly sings that classic rill;
And fairly stands that nameless shrine:
And here, oh, many a sultry noon
And starry eve, that happy June,
Came Angelo and Melanie!
And earth for us was all in tune—
For while Love talk'd with them, Hope walked apart with me.—p. 161.

We should like to give the part leading to the catastrophe in full, but can only make room for a small fragment descriptive of the heroine. We think that those who read this will hardly fail to read the rest:

I have not said that Melanie
Was radiantly fair—
This earth again may never see
A loveliness so rare!
She glided up St. Mona's aisle
That morning as a bride,
And, full as was my heart the while,
I bless'd her in my pride!
The fountain may not fail the less
Whose sands are golden ore,
And a sister for her loveliness
May not be loved the more;
But as, the fount's full heart beneath,
Those golden sparkles shine,
My sister's beauty seem'd to breathe
Its brightness over mine!—pp. 163–4.

Notwithstanding the grace and beauty of this, "Melanie" is by no means the best effort of our author: we think he is much happier, more original, more truly inspired in several of his shorter pieces, as well as in "Lord Ivon and his Daughter," which in spite of the repulsiveness of the subject, is undoubtedly a charming poem. It seems to us that the forte of Willis lies in awakening deep emotion. Few poets can be more startling than he as we have already seen; the poem just mentioned affords sufficient evidence of his power in exciting tragic passion; but it is in moving us to tenderness and compassion he is most successful and most pleasing. In proof of this we need only quote that fine poem:

ON A PICTURE OF A GIRL LEADING HER BLIND MOTHER THROUGH THE WOOD.

The green leaves as we pass
Lay their light fingers on thee unaware,
And by thy side the hazels cluster fair,
And the low forest-grass
Grows green and silken where the wood-paths wind—
Alas! for thee, sweet mother! thou art blind!

And nature is all bright;
And the faint grey and crimson of the dawn,
Like folded curtains from the day are drawn;
And evening's purple light
Quivers in tremulous softness on the sky—
Alas! sweet mother! for thy clouded eye!

The moon's new silver shell
Trembles above thee, and the stars float up,
In the blue air, and the rich tulip's cup
Is pencill'd passing well,
And the swift birds on glorious pinions flee—
Alas! sweet mother! that thou canst not see!

And the kind looks of friends
Peruse the sad expression in thy face,
And the child stops amid his bounding race,
And the tall stripling bends
Low to thine ear with duty unforgot—
Alas! sweet mother! that thou seest them not!

But thou canst *hear!* and love
May richly on a human tone be pour'd,
And the least cadence of a whisper'd word
A daughter's love may prove—
And while I speak thou knowest if I smile,
Albeit thou canst not see my face the while!

Yes, thou canst hear! and He
Who on thy sightless eye its darkness hung,
To the attentive ear, like harps, hath strung
Heaven and earth and sea!
And 'tis a lesson in our hearts to know—
With but one sense the soul may overflow.—pp. 264–5–6.

There is genuine inspiration in this; it is singularly chaste withal both in conception and language; while the most prosy reader can hardly be insensible to its melody. There are many other pieces marked by similar characteristics. This is true, for example, of the "Wife's Appeal," "On seeing a Beautiful Boy at Play," "The Confessional," &c., &c., But we have reached the limits of our space and must conclude abruptly. Not, however, without recording the opinion, that Willis's poetry will survive that of poets who have much higher pretensions. If we are not egregiously mistaken, it will be read much more after the author is dead, like Poe's, than it is now, or perhaps ever has been, for there is more resemblance between the two poets in the salient points of their genius than their countrymen seem to have yet discovered.

The Poetical Works of John Milton; with a Life of the Author; Preliminary Dissertation on each Poem; Notes critical and explanatory; an Index to the subjects of Paradise Lost, and a verbal Index to all the Poems. By CHARLES DEXTER CLEVELAND, Author of Compendiums of English, American, and Classical Literature. 8vo. pp. 688. Philadelphia: Frederick Leypoldt, 1865.

IT is fortunate that the title-page fully indicates the character of this edition, as it only reaches us just as we are closing the last sheet of our present number for the press. It is but justice to say, however, that all the editor promises he has faithfully, intelligently, and successfully performed. None but a student of the ancient classics can appreciate the value of an index of subjects and of words. Thus, for example, how much more valuable is an edition of Virgil, Horace, Juvenal, or Terence, whose complete index enables us to turn at once to the particular subject, or even to the particular *word* we require, let it occur where it may, than the most elegant edition that lacks that advantage? The thought-

l, laborious and learned Jesuits were the first to introduce, in their editions
the Greek and Latin poets, this truly excellent means of facilitating
ference, and economizing labor and time; but no one has made hap-
er use of it in English literature than Professor Cleveland. The expla-
tory notes are also such as we might expect from a man of taste, who
ows how to cull what is most appropriate from those who have written
st on that subject. They contain nothing superfluous; but all that is
eful for such as are likely to read so sublime a poem as Paradise Lost.
e publisher has done his part creditably. We have never seen a vulgar
inferior book bearing his imprint; but in his edition of Milton he has
rpassed himself; yet, considering the enormous prices of all the mate-
ls for book-making, the beautiful volume before us is really a marvel
cheapness.

LEXICOGRAPHY.

American Dictionary of the English Language. By NOAH WEBSTER, LL. D. Thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged and improved, by CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, D.D., LL.D., and NOAH PORTER, D.D. 4to., pp. lxxii., 1768. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1864.

AMERICA may undoubtedly claim the honor of having produced the
o best dictionaries of the English language from the time of Johnson
the present, namely, those of Webster and Worcester. Before the
arto edition of the latter had been published we regarded Webster's
bridged work as the most complete dictionary of the language, al-
ugh marred by peculiarities of orthography and pronunciation. Owing
these blemishes, we thought Worcester's quarto superior to it in these
rticular features, but in no other respect; and what we believed as the
ult of a careful examination and comparison of the two works, we did
t hesitate to publish. Even then we held that Webster's surpassed all
ers in the departments of etymology and definition. In the edition now
fore us, the peculiarities to which we formerly objected are either
olly removed, or given only in connection with the old modes of spell-
; and pronunciation, which we deem most in accordance with the prin-
les of the language. It follows, therefore, in our opinion, that it is the
st Dictionary that either England or America can boast.

Although we had expected much from the labors of the several learned
n engaged for some years in revising the edition of 1847, we confess
t when we came to examine the volume before us, we were not a little
prised at the magnitude and importance of the additions and altera-
ns they have made—additions and alterations which in every instance
veritable and obvious improvements. These alone would form a valu-
le and voluminous work. Indeed they are such that it may be doubted
ether the new edition may any longer be called Webster's Dictionary any
e than Perry's, Kenrick's, Sheridan's, or Walker's may be called John-

son's Dictionary. Each of these took the great English lexicographer for his basis, and in making additions and alterations, depended chiefly, if not exclusively, on his own resources. In the present instance the great American lexicographer forms the basis; but not fewer than a dozen men, each undoubtedly learned in the particular department on which he has been engaged, have contributed the results of their scholarship and experience to the revised edition, including Dr. Mahn, of Berlin; Professors Hadley, Whitney, Gilman, Lyman, Stiles, Judge Perkins, &c., &c.

Thus it may be said that every word, concerning whose orthography, pronunciation, or etymology there was any doubt, has been brought before a jury of *savans*, and has taken its place in the dictionary according to the verdict rendered in its case. If this is not the mode by which a standard can be established, what is? Is it not to such a tribunal that Horace alludes when he tells us that license may be given and taken for the use of words, and that new words may be coined if taken from the true classic source, and so modified as to suit the genius of the language into which they are introduced:

> "Dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter.
> Et nova factaque nuper habebunt verba fidem, si
> Græco fonte cadant, parce detorta."*

No other English dictionary has been compiled on this plan; although the French Academy, the Italian College of Della Crusca, and the Imperial College of Madrid set us the example long since. But let us take a brief glance at the additions and alterations alluded to, bearing in mind that to enter into any details would require an elaborate paper in the body of our journal. This we cannot find time or space for at present; but we are so much pleased with the whole work, in its modified form, that we mean to devote such an article to it on an early occasion. All we can attempt in this notice is, simply, to give our readers a tolerably accurate general idea of what the new editors and their collaborators have accomplished. This will be the more easily understood, if it be borne in mind that what is now called "Webster unabridged," with its various introductory essays, and copious appendix, would furnish sufficient matter to fill a dozen octavo volumes in the ordinary typography of historical works, or novels. In Dr. Porter's preface, which occupies six pages, we have a pretty full account of what has been done; yet we cheerfully admit that it did not lead us to expect so much that is new and valuable as we have found in the course of our examination.

Prof. Goodrich's preface to the edition of 1847, as well as his excellent Memoir of Webster, is retained together with the author's own preface to the edition of 1828. No student of philology should overlook these papers; although they contain far less information than almost

* De Arte Poetica, 51

any of the papers which follow. This is particularly true of the "Brief History of the English Language," by Prof. Hadley of Yale College, which also embraces much more than its title would imply, since it gives a very interesting general idea of the relationship subsisting between the English and several other languages, especially those of the Indo-European family. We are glad to see comparisons and allusions such as we find in this paper, necessarily brief as they are, because they are calculated to awaken in our young men a taste for one of the most beautiful and most philosophical of studies. The sections which exhibit the "general features of the Teutonic languages," and the "influence of other languages on the Anglo-Saxon," claim particular attention for various reasons which it would be foreign to our purpose to explain in this hurried notice. We may remark, however, in passing, that the paper of Prof. Hadley goes far to show, though not directly, that we pay far less attention to the rich, copious, and vigorous language of Goethe and Schiller than we should.

The principles of pronunciation are elaborately explained and copiously illustrated by examples in this edition. Still more careful, if possible, are the pains bestowed on orthography. Referring to this subject, Dr. Porter tells us in his preface that, "In a few classes of words, the Dictionary recommends and follows the peculiar modes of spelling which Dr. Webster introduced for the sake of carrying out the acknowledged analogies of the language—the modes of spelling which, in every instance, *had been previously suggested* by distinguished English grammarians and writers on orthography, such as Lowth, Walker, etc., and the propriety of which has been recognised by Smart and other recent English lexicographers. But to remove every reasonable ground of complaint against the Dictionary in regard to this matter, an alternative orthography is now given in almost every case, the old style of spelling being subjoined to the reformed or new. In two or three instances it has been found that the forms introduced by Dr. Webster, or to which he lent his sanction, *were based upon a mistaken etymology: and therefore these forms have been set aside, and the old spelling has been restored*" (p. viii). In this all that any competent critic ever urged against Dr. Webster is fully and frankly admitted, and the necessary alterations are made accordingly; an observation which applies with equal force to the pronunciation.

Of the remaining features of the Dictionary proper it is needless to speak, since they have met, from the outset, with the approval of all candid scholars at home and abroad. But the voluminous Appendix contains so much that is at once interesting and instructive that even a cursory glance like the present would be incomplete without alluding, at least, to one or two of its features. The "Explanatory and Pronouncing Vocabulary of the Names of Noted Fictitious Persons, Places, &c., by Profes-

sor Wheeler will be acceptable to all who read. So far as names an characters are given the explanations which accompany them are abun dantly satisfactory. Thus, for example, we come to the name Uncle Tob; and find it explained as follows: "The hero of Sterne's novel, 'The Lif and Opinions of Tristram Shandy,' Gent., represented as a captain who ha been wounded at the siege of Namur and forced to retire from the ser vice. He is celebrated for his kindness and benevolence, his courage, gal lantry, and simplicity, no less than for his extreme modesty, his love pas sages with the Widow Wadman, and his military tastes, habits, and discus sions." This is followed by two extracts from reviews, one by Leigh Hun and the other by Hazlitt. The only fault in this department is, that the grea characters of ancient fiction are passed over, and that in too many instance their places are filled up by home characters, in too strict accordance with th adage of making all our own geese swans. But we ought not to expect to much. We have certainly a large amount that is useful and interestin in Professor Wheeler's paper. Those ambitious people who wish to b considered more studious, or more conversant with general literature tha they really are, will be greatly pleased with the "Explanatory Vocabu lary," while there are none who have read so much, let their memory be ever so excellent, but that they will often find it useful.

There are five other pronouncing vocabularies in the Appendix; namely, a vocabulary of Scripture proper names, a vocabulary of Greek and Latin proper names, an etymological vocabulary of modern geographical names, a vocabulary of modern biographical names, and a vocabulary of common English Christian names, male and female, with their derivations, significations, &c. Yet perhaps the most interesting part of the Appendix, is that which contains "A classified collection of Pictorial Illustrations." Not content with giving very good illustrations throughout the work, according as they are needed, the editors present us nearly seventy pages of engravings at the end, all classified as follows: Agriculture and horticulture; anatomy, physiology, phrenology, &c.; antiquities, dress, utensils, &c.; architecture; astronomy; heraldry; ornithology: paleontology; races of men; arms of various nations; flags of various nations; mythology, idols, &c.; modes of punishment; zoophytes; archæology, &c., &c. The thousands of engravings used for this purpose are of no ordinary class; in the great majority of instances, they are at once faithful to the objects intended to be represented, and so tastefully executed as to present an attraction altogether independently of the information which they convey. In a word, the new edition is emphatically a great work. The Dictionary that makes the nearest approach to it is Worcester's; but even the latter is left far in the rear; so far, indeed, that there are few that possess a copy of it, who will any longer be satisfied with it after they have seen the "Webster" of 1864.

We have but one criticism to make: the old title should have been

altered with everything else that was objectionable. It is just as superfluous to say "An American Dictionary of the English Language," as it would be to say "A Scottish History of England," "A Swiss History of France," or "A French History of the Conquest of England by the Normans." But there are instances enough in kind. Many have written dictionaries without belonging to the country whose language they undertook to elucidate; but it is sufficient to mention Sheridan and Sheridan Knowles, neither of whom allowed his patriotism to get the better of his judgment so far as to style his work "An Irish Dictionary of the English Language." This, however, is but a slight fault; the Dictionary is nothing the worse for having one superfluous word on the title-page; and we do not suppose that any one will reject so invaluable a work on that account.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Influence of the War on the Newspaper Press. Pamphlet, 8vo., pp. 37. New York: John Williams, 1864.

SLENDER as this pamphlet is, it embodies a considerable amount of interesting information, and yet its greatest fault is its brevity. The enormous rise in the price of paper, printing, and printing materials is not discussed as its importance demands. There is a similar meagreness in speaking of the increased rates of subscription, and the effect of that increase on the advertising patronage of particular journals. The pamphlet is such, however, that, had it reached us in time, we would have reviewed it at length, and thus enabled our readers to form an opinion of their own as to the value of its suggestions. As it is, we can only say, in general terms, that it is worthy of careful pernsal.

We learn from it that there are now but two penny papers in the United States, the "Philadelphia Daily News" and the "Baltimore Sun;" and that there are but few three-cent journals that contain so much reading matter as the former, or that are printed on such good paper. More than the author of the brochure before us have remarked this; they have remarked, moreover, that the paper alluded to is conducted with an energy and ability rarely equalled. To this fact we can ourselves bear emphatic testimony. Mr. Joseph R. Flanigen, the editor and proprietor, is one of the most vigorous and attractive newspaper writers in the country, and one of the most active and indefatigable businessmen. We are glad, therefore, to learn, from this pamphlet, that Mr. F. is more than requited already by the steady increase of his advertising patronage, for continuing to furnish the public such a large amount of useful reading matter for one cent.

An Epitome of General Ecclesiastical History from the earliest period with a condensed account of the Jews since the destruction of Jerusalem. By JOHN MARSH, D.D. Sixteenth edition, revised, &c. Large 12mo., pp. 464. New York: W. W. Dodd, 1864.

THE title-page of this work gives a pretty correct idea of its character. Although we cannot agree with the author in all his statements, especially when he is endeavoring to account for certain results, we must do him the justice to say that in general he is impartial, and always means to be fair and conciliatory to all sects. Works of this kind we always recommend, let their authors belong to what denomination they may. But we detest bigotry as not only illogical, but unchristian. If our writers would bear in mind that no really pious man ever hated any one for differing in opinion with him as to the best means of salvation, but that such hatred is the result of ignorance and narrow-mindedness, there would be much fewer offensive "religious" books than there are.

Fragrance from Crushed Flowers. Boston: American Tract Society (N. Broughton). New York: John G. Broughton.

THE title of this little volume is exceedingly appropriate; and this we are well aware, is high praise. But small as it is, it contains several pieces of remarkable tenderness and pathos—such as we would recommend as no ordinary specimens of "tuneful tears." Who will deny, for example, that the following lines are imbued with genuine "fragrance," sad though it be:

OUR TRANSPLANTED FLOWERS.

We brought the wild-wood blossoms
  In winter to our home,
To while away the darksome days
  Till spring and bloom should come.
But ah, they would not flourish—
  Those poor, transplanted flowers;
We only tore them from their home
  To fade and die in ours.

The leaves grew pale and sickly,
  The buds were thin and small;
Robbed of their native light and air,
  They would not thrive at all.

'Twas then we knew, while watching
  Those simple, meek-eyed flowers,
Why God his messenger had sent
  For that sweet bud of ours.
Born in his own bright heaven,
  On earth it could not com
To its celestial loveliness,
  And so he took it home.

There are none of our religious societies that exhibit more discrimination, taste, or good sense in their selections than the Tract Society of Boston. Their books are almost invariably such as may be read by any denomination of Christians, with full confidence of their containing nothing sectarian or bigoted.

1. *Harry Watson of Easterton:* A Story illustrating the Beatitudes.
2. *Maggie: A Christmas Story.* By MARIA H. BULFINCH.
3. *The Courtland Children.* By M. M.
4. *A Queen: A Story for Girls.* Translated from the German of MADAME OTTALIE WILDERNUTH. By ANNA B. COOKE.

New York: Genl. Prot. Episc. S. School Union, 1864.

As the titles imply, these are but tiny volumes, but what they contain is admirably suited for those for whom they are intended, happily blending ing as they do what is most pleasing with what is most useful to children. In "Harry Watson" we are told the story in a clear and simple style, of a boy who through various trials carries out the principles illustrated in the beatitudes. There is more incident and adventure in this, combined with a more skilfully constructed plot, than we find in many a pretentious novel. "Maggie" relates the experiences of a family reduced to poverty, after the father's death, by the speculations of the grandfather, so that they became dependent for their support on the labor of two of their number, Phillip and Magaret, mere children as the latter are. The mother becomes ill, Phillip loses his situation, and Maggie is deprived of the sewing she has been doing for various people. Christmas Day finds them in a sad plight; but as the industrious and well-disposed rarely, if ever, fail in their efforts to earn a livelihood, they ultimately succeed, and are the means of making the whole family, including the speculating grandfather, both religious and happy.

In "The Courtland Children" we have a pretty, simply-told story of a twin brother and sister, who are first introduced to us looking at a great fire in a certain street, where a number of poor families are found houseless next day. The little ones will be startled at some of the incidents, but will learn a useful lesson from each. Nor will they be likely to content themselves with one reading of a book which has laid so warm a hold on their sympathies.

But the best story of all is "A Queen." There is philosophy as well as truth in this; and at the same time there is a veritable fascination in its lively but unpretending style. Its heroine, "Maggie," is an orphan child taken into the family of a German peasant, and who in her simplicity wishes to be "a queen." For this she is laughed at in the beginning; but in time she proves that although she has no crown or throne, she can nevertheless, rule by her amiable manner all who come within the sphere of her influence. In the second chapter, the peasant's eldest son falls in love with her, much to the disgust of his parents, who would have him regard her merely as a "charity child." She is so much persecuted on account of the preference of the young peasant, that she is obliged to leave; but after a long separation the lovers are finally married, and become the parents of an interesting family. In a word, no story that we

have read in a long time is so well calculated to impress on the you mind the advantages arising from contentment and a gentle, happy d sition.

1. *Trinity Collection of Church Music, &c.* By EDWARD HODGES, Doc., with valuable additions by the Editor, S. Parkman Tucke Mus. Doc. Large 4to., pp. 240.
2. *Organ Gems; A Collection of Offertories, Elevations, Commu Preludes, Fugues, &c.* By ANDRE, BATISTE, BROSIG, HESSE, FE and others. Arranged and edited by Frederic S. Davenport. pp. 80.

Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co.

IT is sufficient to say of the "Trinity Collection" that it contai we are assured by the editor, "all the psalm and hymn tunes, cl &c., used in Trinity Church, New York, or in either of its three cha We may add, however, that the work is got up in the usual tastefu curate, and substantial style of the Messrs. Ditson & Co., and that i the advantages of a Metrical Index of Tunes, an Index to the Cho Chants, and Music for occasional services, and a general Alphabetic dex.

The "Organ Gems" is worthy of its title, containing as it do choicest *morceaux*, selected from the most eminent composers of music. Among the fifty pieces which constitute the contents, are se of the best specimens of sacred music used in any branch of the Chr Church; such, for example, as "Quis est Homo," by Bordese; "O Nobis," by Novello; "Romanza," from the eighth symphony of Ha "Ave verum Corpus," by Mozart, and the Gloria from the Second by the same composer. To this we need hardly add that few appropriate presents could be made during the holidays, to a lady h a taste for music, than one or both of these elegant books.

1. *Wings and Webs.* By the author of "Violet," "Daisy," &c.
2. *Lives of Familiar Insects.*
3. *Aunt Annie's* Rainy-Day Stories.

Boston: Taggard & Thompson, 1864.

THE tasteful volumes of the well-known "Summer-house Series," make many a young heart glad during the approaching holidays those who read them will not easily forget the excellent lessons they inculcate in so agreeable a manner. "Wings and Webs," and " of Familiar Insects," are well calculated to prepossess the youthful in favor of natural history. The plan of each is worthy of imit and that it is successfully carried out, few intelligent parents or guar will deny. The three volumes are in the form of letters purporting written by flowers and insects, as well as by more pretentious perso each giving his views in character, and combining amusement wi

struction. The interest and value of the natural history stories are much enhanced by appropriate illustrations.

Alley Moore: A Tale of the Times. Showing how Evictions, Murder, and such-like pastimes are managed, and justice administered in Ireland; together with many stirring incidents in other lands. By FATHER BAPTIST. 2 vols. in one. Boston: P. Donahoe, 1864.

THIS volume only reached us just as we were going to press; such is its character that we should otherwise have reviewed it at length, for we have been eye-witnesses to some of the startling scenes which it so graphically and truthfully describes.

1. *The Martin and Nelly Stories; or, The Two Fairy Dreams.* By JOSEPHINE FRANKLIN, author of "Nelly and Her Friends," "Nelly's First School-Days," &c., &c.
2. *Martin.* By JOSEPHINE FRANKLIN, author of "Nelly and Her Boat," &c., &c.

Boston: Taggard and Thompson, 1864.

WE have found it much more agreeable to examine these tiny volumes than many pretentious novels in thick duodecimo form. They are written in that simple, but suggestive, communicative style which rarely fails to captivate the minds of children, and give them the impression that it is pleasant rather than irksome to learn useful lessons. The series entitled "The Martin and Nelly Stories," to which they belong, are favorites with the little ones throughout the country. As we have not seen the rest, we can only say that, if they are equal to the new volumes, they deserve all that is said in their favor even by the most enthusiastic of their admirers.

Insurance Papers, Statements, &c. New York, Boston, and Philadelphia.

THE insurance documents of the past month are remarkably barren of interest; it would, however, be very erroneous to infer from this that there has been any falling off in the business, for the contrary is the fact. Never were our principal companies more actively employed; we doubt whether they ever received, or paid a larger amount during any corresponding month than they have during that which ended on the 15th of December instant. But at this season very little is published on the subject; scarcely any but the quacks make much fuss at Christmas times.

It is incredible what a large number of new companies have commenced operations lately. We have ourselves counted eighteen, and we are assured that there are nearly as many more. Those who have obtained charters, and complied with the requirements of the State Superintendent, do not probably exceed half a dozen. Several of the new corporations, with and without charters, do not seem to inspire much confidence; and so far as we can judge from appearances, we think the public right in being a little sceptical. At the same time we refrain from mak-

ing any observations in respect to any particular company which mi injure its prospects, bearing in mind that appearances often deceive.

It seems, indeed, difficult to believe that parties, who do not fin convenient, or advisable to secure any better office than a small basem whose furniture would scarcely bring fifty dollars at auction, insure either life or property to the extent of tens of thousands of doll But those who act most suspiciously are entitled to a fair trial, bef they are pronounced guilty of any attempt to defraud those who cho to pay them for their policies, even when they undertake to insure thi never insured before.

We are assured that much more damage was done to American shipp by the recent cyclone on the coast of India than was at first suppos We are informed that several New York vessels, laden with large and v able cargoes, were totally wrecked; but most of them were insu wholly, or in part, by some of our best companies, who have already gi their checks for large sums. Were we to mention the sums thus p by the Columbian Marine Insurance and the Mercantile Mutual, Wall street, we should seem to be indulging in the fabulous, and should at the same time displease the principal officers of those co panies, who literally prefer to do good by "stealth and blush to fin fame."

There are good fire companies to be found in all parts of the city; b if we are not very grossly misinformed, the really reliable marine co panies are nearly, if not exclusively, confined to Wall street. From o own knowledge we do not know anything to the contrary, but rat think the information we have received is correct. Nay, from appearances we should hardly think it safe to insure a ferry horse-boat half the marine companies out of Wall street. Not that we can prete to have much faith in all the marine companies in the latter. Thus, example, the Sun Mutual may be a very excellent institution, and ev have some distant resemblance to the great luminary whose na it bears; but we confess that if we had a ship insured in that quarter, a heard it was wrecked, we should have serious misgivings as to whet we should ever receive the amount of our policy. We should be afr that the blame would be thrown on the captain, or the first or seco mate; or, if anything of that kind would not do, on the shipbuilder, the shipcarpenter. But we had almost forgotten that the Security F Insurance Company of Pine street, is now empowered to carry on t marine business also; and in order to do so the more effectually, it h increased its capital stock to $1,000,000, making its total ass $1,462,643. This, therefore, may be regarded as an exception to t general character of the trans-Wall street marine companies.

Of the Wall street fire companies the record is different, so far as we aware. We do not remember more than one in the whole street

which the public seems to have much confidence, and even this one is partly out of Wall street, we mean the Morris Fire and Inland Insurance Company, the principal entrance to whose building is on Nassau street. For the rest we know no Wall street fire company equal to the Washington or Hope, of Broadway. True, it can boast a good and well-managed life company, one of the best in the country, namely the United States. For the sake of many a widow and orphan, would that the Washington Life or the Guardian Life were equal to it! The prestige of Broadway is well sustained, however, by life companies like the New York, the Equitable, the Knickerbocker, and the Globe. In our opinion the first mentioned would be one of the first in the world, were it not that its presiding officer is sometimes a little rash in arriving at conclusions—a failing, however, which Alexander was as much subject to as he, as we may see from the course sometimes pursued by that great conqueror, even towards his best friends, Aristotle and Parmenio. But if in our opinion the gentleman of the New York Life does not always reason like the Stagyrite on certain recondite subjects, we have not the less faith in his policy on this account, but cheerfully admit that the widow and orphan are entirely safe in his hands.

We know no young company whose prospects are so bright as those of the Globe Mutual Life. We have had the curiosity to compare its first efforts with those of twelve companies now become celebrated for their success, and found that any of them have not received as many premiums during the whole of the first year as the Globe has in the first five months, and that only one received half as many. Of the several new companies that have not yet commenced operations, the only one we know to be possessed of all the necessary resources is the Universal Life Insurance Company of this city, whose plan is as new in this country as itself, since "it purposes to devote itself chiefly," as the directors announce, "to granting insurances upon the lives of invalids, or parties, who, for some specific or general objection on the score of health, have been refused admittance into the various existing life insurance companies." This may seem a rash undertaking, but it has been tested in England by an experience of forty years, and found entirely successful. Among the members of the board of directors, whose names inspire full confidence, is that of Henry B. Hyde, Esq., Vice-President of the Equitable Life, one of the best managed and most prosperous life companies in this country.

The Home continues to be the "observed of all observers" among the fire companies. The worthy president has never forgiven us for presenting his photograph to our readers, comparing him to the illustrious Barnum, and criticising his contributions to the Sunday papers. This, however, will not prevent us from doing justice to his superior skill in that art of "quack, quack," which makes his company superior to all others in the world, so far as words and their repetition *ad infinitum* can produce

that effect. In visiting prisons and lunatic asylums in all parts of th country for the purpose of learning what we could, we were sure to me with the Home "statement" in some corner or another. We now have on every page of the City Directory, and in every other place where t miracles of the quack doctors are blazoned forth. Not content with this, the distinguished chief officer of that corporation get up maps, which they also proclaim their enormous capital, their inexhaustible sets, &c., all ending, *ex more*, like the refrain of a song, with the inevitab "Chas. J. Martin, Prest.; A. F. Wilmarth, V.-Prest.; and John McG Secy." Now, if Mr. Barnum has ever gone further than this to puff Museum, it is one of the many things of which we are ignorant.

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XX.

MARCH, 1865.

ART. I.—1. *Orlando Furioso* di Messer LODOVICO ARIOSTO. 6 vols. Milano, 1812.

2. *The Orlando Furioso, Translated into English Verse;* from the Italian of LUDOVICO ARIOSTO, with notes. By WILLIAM STEWART ROSE. London: Murray.

3. *Opere Minori in Verso e in Prosa* di LODOVICO ARIOSTO, *ordinate e annotate.* Per cura di Filippo-Luigi Polidori. 2 vols. Firenze, 1857.

OF all modern writers, Ariosto has afforded the critics the most ample themes. More than six generations have warmly disputed as to whether his principal poem should receive one name or another; and the question is still undecided. Some maintain that it is an epic, others that it is a romance, while a third party are equally zealous in undertaking to prove that it is neither an epic nor a romance, but a species of poetry peculiar to the author. These disputes, resumed as they are every succeeding age with renewed vigor, would show by themselves that, let its faults be what they may, the *Orlando Furioso* possesses the impress of true genius.

But they have been productive of much more important results, for those regarding the poem as an epic have compared it with all other epics, and pointed out the characteristics of each; those regarding it as a romance have pursued a similar course on the opposite side; while the third party have instituted comparisons with the epic and the romance, in order to show how totally different the great poem of Ariosto is from both. Each of the three parties have found

it necessary to give quotations from the works compared, accompanied with their own criticisms. The effect of all this on the public mind could not be otherwise than beneficial, altogether independently of the question at issue. Not only has it caused many to read Ariosto who would never have done so had no such influence been brought to bear upon them; it has also caused many to read the other poets to whom he has been compared; and in both cases the reader has been more or less prepared to appreciate the work he has taken up by the principles of taste inculcated by the disputants.

In alluding to these discussions and their results, we must not forget their primary cause, especially as we must regard Ariosto as right or wrong in many instances, according as he has been influenced by that cause, or otherwise. The best critics of all enlightened countries—nay, indeed, all educated men—still regard the "Laws" of Aristotle as the surest test of the principal kinds of poetry, particularly of the epic; and accordingly they hold that a poem which cannot bear this test is defective. Ariosto has been severely censured on this ground; many have gone so far as to deny that he is a poet at all, because his chief production is so irregular. That there is much incongruity in it cannot be denied; there is probably more than in any other poem whatever. It has more *dramatis personæ* than the Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Æneid put together; it contains more of the supernatural than all other poems, with perhaps the sole exception of Paradise Lost; it abounds more also in episodes; and there is scarcely one of its many stories which is not sure to break off abruptly where it is most interesting; although, in general, it is resumed again when it is least expected, and is invested with such renewed interest that the reader soon asks himself whether the poet ought to be censured after all, however much he has violated the unities, and however much suspense he has caused.* But sometimes

* Ariosto leaves no doubt as to what his object was in making these chasms in his stories; in proof of the fact we need only transcribe the following lines:

"Come raccende il gusto il mature esca
Così mi par, che le mia istoria, quanto,
Or quà, or là pire variata, sià
Meno, a chi l'udirà noisa sia."

"As at the board, with plenteous viands grac'd,
Cate after cate excites the sick'ning taste;
So, while my muse repeats her varied strains,
Tale following tale the ravish'd ear detains."

y so broken off is never resumed; and there is at
e instance of his bringing one of his heroes into active
long after he has slain him. This is the case, for ex-
with Balastro, whose death is recorded in the forty-
nza of the eighteenth canto, but who, nevertheless,
life in the seventy-third stanza of the fortieth canto!
are defects undoubtedly, but what human work is
defects? Before we attempt to decide whether the
Furioso has any claim to be regarded as an epic on
of its irregularity; or in other words, before we ex-
y opinion as to the merits of any of the various
of the disputants alluded to, let us refer to the
y by which all profess to be more or less guided,
whether, after all, the rules of Aristotle would, if
nterpreted, exclude the poem of Ariosto from the
of epics on any other ground than that of its want
, assuming that it does not possess the latter quality,
lisputed by eminent critics. "Hence, as we have
observed," says the Stagyrite, "in this respect also
will appear to be divine, when compared with other
ecause he did not attempt to sing of the whole of the
war, though it had a beginning and an end. For if
it would have been very great and not sufficiently
ious; or if it had been of a moderate size, it would
en intricate through the variety of incidents. But
ving selected one part of the war, *he has made use of*
isodes; such as the catalogue of the ships and other
s with which he has adorned his poem."*
renowned critic then proceeds to show how other
ave been written. "Other poets, however," he
, "have composed a fable about one man, and one
d one action *consisting of many parts*, as the authors
yprics and lesser Iliad." Those who maintain that
ndo Furioso is an epic, refer to the observations just
as authority; and they also quote Aristotle in defend-
r author from the charge of having indulged too much
upernatural. "It is necessary, therefore, in tragedies,"
es the Stagyrite, "to produce the wonderful; but that
is *contrary to reason* (whence the wonderful is best
d) *is best suited to the epopee* from the agent not
en. In the next place, the particulars respecting
uit of Hector, which would appear ridiculous in the

* Poetics, chap. xxiii.

scene; the Greeks, indeed, standing still and not pursuing, and Achilles making signs to them by the motion of his head not to engage. But *in the epopee this is concealed.* Now the wonderful pleases, of which this is an indication, that all men when they wish to gratify their hearers add something to what they relate."*

This shows that those who condemn the supernatural machinery of Ariosto on the ground that it is contrary to reason, cannot claim the authority of Aristotle in doing so. In short, the Stagyrite admits everything that is favorable to the claims of those who maintain that the *Orlando Furioso* is an epic. He allows the introduction into the poem of absurdities, and only requires that the poet has sufficient genius, taste, and skill to conceal those absurdities from vulgar gaze. "Again," he says, "one should prefer things which are *impossible*, but probable, to such as are possible, but improbable." It is hardly necessary to remark, that this has reference to the genius and skill of the poet in making the impossible *seem* probable. Lest there might be any reasonable doubt as to his meaning, the great critic makes the following additional remark: "Since the irrational circumstances in the Odyssey, such as Ulysses being left on the shore of Ithaca by the Phœnicians, *would evidently have been intolerable, if they had been fabricated by a bad poet.* But now the poet (Homer) conceals the absurdity, and renders it pleasing by the addition of other beauties."† We see, then, that according to the best authority, ancient or modern, a great poem may consist of many parts; admit not only the supernatural, but what is evidently impossible and absurd, and still be an epic.

It cannot be pretended that Ariosto has made use of any machinery more unnatural than what is here alluded to. The worst charge against him is that he has availed himself to excess of each of the privileges allowed by the best judges; and it must be admitted that it is one which is well founded. He has, indeed, scarcely introduced anything more wonderful than Homer has done; the difficulty is that there is a much larger variety of supernatural incidents and occurrences in the *Orlando Furioso* than in either the Iliad or the Odyssey. It is true, however, that the majority, if not the whole, may be referred to those of Greek and Roman story for example. In order that we may not seem rash in this assertion, in the

* Poetics, chap. xxiii. † *Ibid.* chap. xxiv.

eyes of those who have not devoted sufficient attention to the subject, we will note a few instances as they occur to our memory. Thus, if Rogero's ring affords him protection against the arts of his mistress, this is not more improbable or more absurd than that the herb moly affords Ulysses similar protection against the enchantments of the daughter of the Sun. If the same Rogero was carried away by a hippogriff, that could fly off to India or Arabia like a bird, while the fleetest racer, not possessed of wings, could perform the journey of a few miles, had not that wonderful animal his prototype in the renowned Pegasus, or Bellerophon? The magical operations of Alcina in her enchanted castle are indeed very wonderful · but who will maintain that they are more so than those of Circe? If the cup of the former transformed men into monsters, so did that of the latter. The polished shield in the *Orlando*, which it was certain death to look upon, has its counterpart in the Gorgon's head, which was used precisely for the same purpose, and which possessed exactly the same qualities. If Angelica has been exposed to a sea monster and rescued, the circumstances are not in any manner more absurd, or more incredible, than those under which Perseus is represented to have saved Andromeda from a similar monster. We might easily multiply instances; but enough for the present. We will now only ask those who are too ready to condemn Ariosto as too extravagant in the use of machinery, to remember that Homer metamorphosed the companions of Ulysses into swine; that he shut up the winds in goats' skins; that he furnished the musicians with fishes' tails that ate all who approached them; that he made his Mars large enough to cover several acres, &c. Virgil, Tasso, and Milton have noted incidents equally wonderful, not to say equally impossible or absurd; yet no critic worthy of the name denies that they are entitled to be ranked among epic poets.

It had, however, been much better for the fame of Ariosto if his poem had been regarded merely as a heroic romance; better, indeed, that it had received any other name than that of epic, for the reason that most foreign critics have no sooner decided on calling it an epic than they have condemned it as an utter failure; not because they think it is not poetical; not because they find it difficult to read it; for nothing of this kind is alleged against it by those who have attacked it most severely. On the contrary, almost all who have carefully read it agree in admitting that it possesses a larger

variety of attractions—a greater number of really beautif passages—perhaps than any other poem, with the sole e ception of the Iliad or the Odyssey. That is, they adm that it is possessed of excellent materials, but they mainta that those materials are unskilfully put together. In a wo the *form* is what they object to. They say it is not artisti and in general they are right. It must be admitted th whatever is at variance with the principles of art is to a ce tain extent defective; yet the diamond is not the less a di mond for not being cut according to the prevailing tas Even though it has a flaw, it is still a diamond. Superfi cloth or silk is not the less elegant or beautiful as such, b cause it has not been cut according to the principles of a In nature, too, the most beautiful landscapes are often the which are most irregular. It is admitted that the poet w makes the nearest approach to perfection is he who imita nature most closely and most successfully. But how rare do we find two scenes in nature that are exactly alike? Ev two mountains or two rivers are seldom if ever so like eac other but that one possesses characteristics entirely differen from those of the other. The Lake of Como differs in many respects from the Lake of Constance, but how absurd it would be to find fault with either because it is not like the other! As well find fault with a rose because it is not like a tulip, or with an Italian lady because, although confessedly possessed of many charms, she is different in some features from a French, English, or American lady whom some choose to regard as a model.

But Ariosto's own countrymen, who understand him best, award him the highest rank as a poet. They tell foreigners who charge him with extravagance to bear in mind that when he wrote, there was a general belief in necromancy, witchcraft, fairies, &c.; and they ask, was it not his duty as a poet to construct his fable accordingly?—adding that if he did not do so, he could not be regarded as delineating the manners of the age.

It is not the less true, however, that in Italy, as well as in France, Germany, and England, the merits of Ariosto have afforded subjects of warm dispute for centuries. But the chief question has been, not whether the author of the *Orlando Furioso* is an epic poet, and as such entitled to high rank, but whether he is equal or superior to the author of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*. It would be difficult to convince those unacquainted with the subject, that this discussion has

created such intense excitement among the *literati* of Italy, as it really has for more than three centuries. It has not indeed been as bloody as the disputes between the Guelphs and Ghibellines; although more than one are said to have died of the Ariosto and Tasso excitement.

The admirers of Ariosto seem to have been more learned and influential, if not more numerous, than those of Tasso, for we find that the celebrated Accademia della Crusca has given a public preference to Ariosto. As might have been expected, this greatly irritated the admirers of Tasso, and gave rise to numerous epigrams. Chapelain, one of the warmest champions of Tasso, makes some remarks on the subject, which are worth quoting. "I thank you," he writes in a letter to a friend, "for the sonnet which your indignation dictated, at the Academy's preference of Ariosto to Tasso. This judgment is overthrown by the confessions of many of the *Cruscanti*, my associates. It would be tedious to enter into its discussion; but it was passion and not equity that prompted that decision. We confess, that, *as to what concerns invention and purity of language, Ariosto has evidently the advantage of Tasso;* but majesty, pomp, numbers, and a style truly sublime, united to regularity of design, raise the latter so much above the other that no comparison can fairly exist."

Upon the whole, this is not unfair. If it be borne in mind that invention is one of the highest attributes of genius, and one of the most essential requisites of an epic, it will hardly be denied that even according to the estimate of Chapelain, the Academy was right after all. Riccoboni tells us,* that Tasso himself acknowledged the superiority of Ariosto. Be this as it may, it is certain that Tasso's father regarded the *Orlando* as the greatest poem of modern times. Writing to a friend on the subject, before he supposed that his son could ever be regarded as the rival of its author, he says: "There is no man of learning, no mechanic, no lad, no girl, no old man, who are satisfied to read the *Orlando Furioso* once. This poem serves as a solace to the traveller, who, fatigued on his journey, deceives his lassitude by chanting some octaves of this poem. You may hear them sing these stanzas in the streets and in the fields every day." Nor was the father of Tasso an indifferent judge; for he too was a poet of no mean pretensions, and a man of high culture, withal. But

* See his *Histoire du Theatre Italien*, vol. i., p. 52.

it is not alone the best Italian critics who have given a decid preference to Ariosto; the best foreign critics have done t same.

None are so severe on those who violate the unities the French; none set a higher value on regularity of desig But the greatest of French critics are Voltaire and Boilea one, the author of an epic poem himself—a universal genius the other also a poet, and deserved to be called the Frenc Horace, from his exquisite taste, as well as on account of h admirable poem entitled *L'Art Poetique*. "But the romanc of Ariosto is so full of variety," says the author of th *Henriade*, "and so fertile in beauties of all kinds, that afte having once read it quite through, I only wish to begin i again. How great the charm of natural poetry! I neve could read a single canto of the poem in a prose translatio That which above all charms me in this wonderful work i that the author is always above his subject and treats it play fully. He says the most sublime things without effort, and h often finishes them by a turn of pleasantry, which is neithe misplaced nor far-fetched. It is at once the Iliad, th Odyssey, and Don Quixote. * * The *Orlando Furio* possesses a merit unknown to the ancients—it is that of it exordiums. Every canto is like an enchanted palace, th vestibule of which is always in a different taste—sometime majestic, sometimes simple and even grotesque. It is moral lively or gallant, and always natural and true." *

This is the estimate of one the excellence of whose tast cannot be disputed. We do not indeed accept that par of his dictum in which he represents Ariosto as combinin the best qualities of Homer and Cervantes. This we regard a a whim similar to his preferring the Æneid to the Iliad; bu with this exception, we hold that he has not in the least ex aggerated the wonderful charms of the *Orlando*.

Now, let us see what Boileau says of Ariosto's rival. Th admirers of the latter, not content with declaring him supe rior to all modern poets, maintained that he is quite the equal, if not the superior, of Virgil. This excited the indig nation of Boileau, who immediately wrote a criticism on the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, in which he showed how greatly the indiscreet admirers of its author had violated classical ma jesty, in attempting to compare him at all to Virgil. Some time before his death he was asked by a critic whether he

* Dictionnaire Philosophique de Voltaire, art. *Poésie Epique*.

had repented of his celebrated decision concerning the merits of Tasso: "I have so little changed my opinion," he replied, "that on a reperusal, lately, of Tasso, I was sorry that I had not more amply explained myself on this subject in some of my reflections on Longinus. I should have begun by acknowledging that Tasso has a sublime genius, of great compass, with happy dispositions for the higher poetry. But when I came to the use he made of his talents, I should have shown that *judicious discernment rarely prevailed in his works*. That in the greater portion of his narrations he attached himself to the agreeable oftener than to the just. That his descriptions are almost always overcharged with superfluous ornaments. That in painting the strongest passions, and in the midst of the agitations they excite, he frequently degenerates into witticisms which abruptly destroy the pathetic. That he abounds with images of too florid a kind; affected terms; conceits and frivolous thoughts, which, far from being adapted to his *Gerusalemme*, could hardly be supportable in his *Aminta*. So that all this opposed to the gravity, the sobriety, the majesty of Virgil, what is it but tinsel compared with gold." Those who have criticised Ariosto most severely have not ventured to pass so general a sentence of condemnation on him as this. Even Chapelain, as we have already seen, speaks of him in very different terms.

But before we proceed any further, it is proper that we should note such authenticated facts of Ariosto's life as have been preserved. His career was not eventful, but there is much in it that is instructive as well as interesting. He was born on the 8th of September, 1474, at Regio, of which town his father was governor for the Duke of Ferrara. This fact would show that the family was respectable and not without influence. There are scarcely any celebrated authors of whose precocious talents we have not wonderful accounts; but in the case of young Lodivico those accounts are well attested. Some of the stories which he dramatized when a mere boy for the amusement of his brothers and sisters are still extant, and they are such as many men who have written ambitiously for the stage need not be ashamed to own. Although his father had a taste for poetry himself, he wished his son to turn his attention to other objects rather than to the Muses. Having held several offices of a judicial or magisterial character under the duke, it was but natural that he should wish his son to study law, and accordingly he made ample provision for his doing so. Lodovico devoted five years

to the legal profession; but it does not appear that he mad much progress. He had no taste for the dry details of law especially as it was practised within the limited sphere of the ducal courts; yet, so anxious was he to gratify his father that, during these five years, he almost entirely neglected those studies and pursuits most congenial to his own mind.

When at the age of twenty, his father became convinced that, after all, his son was not suited for the law; and, accordingly, told him that he might consult his own tastes in the future. The first impulse of Lodovico was to return to the study of the classics, which his father had induced him to abandon years ago. The works to which he devoted himself most particularly were those of Plautus and Terence. In a short time he mastered both; then he betook himself to writing comedies, in which he reproduced the old plots but made the characters new. An anecdote is related of his conduct at this time which is worth noting. In a discussion with his father on a literary subject, the latter became quite angry, and used violent language, if, indeed, he did not give vent to his passion in blows, as some allege. At all events, the poet made no resistance, but remained silent. He subsequently convinced his brothers that the anger of his father arose wholly from his misconception of the facts. "And why did you not show him that this was the case, and vindicate yourself?" "The truth is," replied Lodovico, "I was thinking only of a passage in my play of Cassaria, in which an old man quarrels with his son; and I was watching my father's words and gestures, for the purpose of learning how I might increase the effect of the scene." It is related of him, that he was in the habit, at the same time, of attending the courts, as well as the theatre, for a similar purpose. Whenever a beautiful woman was within his reach, he was sure to adopt some plan to see her. But whether his sole motive in wishing to contemplate the beautiful was to prepare himself for those admirable portraitures which he has given us in his *Orlando* is another question, and one to which we may refer again before we close our remarks. Suffice it to say here, that, no matter how he obtained his knowledge of human nature, no other poet, except, perhaps, Homer and Shakespeare, has portrayed it more faithfully; even the author of the Iliad or the author of Hamlet has not excelled him in describing female beauty.*

* His portrait of the enchantress Alcina alone, the Italian impersonation of

en Ariosto reached the age of twenty-four, his father aving the family but a limited means of support. et exerted himself to the utmost, and was so far suc- :hat he was soon enabled to furnish marriage portions isters, and also to afford some means for his brothers. only now that he began to write his smaller poems. alian and Latin pieces, known as his *Opere Minori*, ritten between his twenty-fifth and thirtieth year. in poems show that when he returned to the study classics, as intimated above, he did so in earnest, for asess not a little of the true classic spirit. "I versi messer Ludovico," says Polidori, "sono una prova as- ndida dell' educazione litteraria da lui ricevuta nella gioventù, e la confema in atto di ciò ch'egli afferma, endosi dell' aver avuto a mæstro Gregorio da Spoliti, tira settima e nell' ode qui prossima, sotto il numero l'he Latin satires and odes now alluded to, and of ve have an edition before us, have been accepted by st competent judges in every country in Europe as ng all the merits which Polidori claims for them. 'as his Latin satires which first attracted the attention Cardinal Hippolito of Este, son of Hercules the nd brother of the reigning duke. "One who can o well in Latin," observed the cardinal, "can ish something in the vernacular worthy of being

h Dolce has quoted in his dialogue on painting as a picture of perfect uld fully justify this remark, and accordingly we give Rose's transla- until we have time and space to transcribe other passages of a kindred

In the original this is so perfect that not a word could be altered; het, allusion, and simile is true to nature:

e is of such perfect symme-
to feign the industrious ter knows,
and knotted tresses; to the
ow gold with brighter lustre rs.
tender cheek the mingled
red, of the lily and the rose.
smooth, the forehead gay round
e space and forms a fitting nd.
; and slender arches rise re
r black eyes, say suns of ant light;

Which ever softly beam and slowly move;
Round these appears to sport in frolic flight,
Hence scattering all his shafts, the little Love,
And seems to plunder hearts in open sight.
Thence, through mid visage, does the nose descend,
Where Envy finds not blemish to amend.

As if between two vales, which softly curl,
The mouth with vermeil tint is seen to glow:
Within are strung two rows of orient pearl,

remembered."* This was told to Ariosto, had its effect upon him. Yet we are told that whe took a copy of the *Orlondo* to his patron, the latter v means pleased with it, well disposed as he undoubt towards the author; for his remark was, "Where coul found these good-for-nothing fooleries?" But wh cardinal liked the poem or not, we have good evidence liked the author; and that he did not regard hin ish is best attested by the fact that he engaged him i matters of importance, business which required b dence and skill. Nor have we any reason to think was disappointed in doing so, but the contrary, sinc that it was through his influence the poet subsequ tered into the service of Alphonso, Duke of Ferrar

---

Which her delicious lips shut up or show.
Of force to melt the heart of any churl,
However rude, hence courteous accents flow;
And here that gentle smile receives its birth,
Which opes at will a paradise on earth.

Like milk—the bosom, and the neck of snow;
Round is the neck, and full and large the breast;
Where, fresh and firm, two ivory apples grow,
Which rise and fall, as, to the margin press'd
By pleasant breeze, the billows come and go.

Not prying Argus could rest.
Yet might the observing e conceal'd
Conjecture safely from the veal'd.

To all her arms a just prop
And a white hand is ofte cried,
Which narrow is, and some and where
No knot appears, nor vein
For finish of that stately sha
A foot, neat, short, and neath is spied,
Angelic visions, creatures
Conceal'd beneath no cover lie."

*Cardinal Bembo, than whom there was no better judge in was so well pleased with the Latin compositions of Ariosto, that him to write all his works in that language. To this Ariosto replied though much gratified by the flattering recommendation of the lea nal, he preferred being the first of Italian writers to being the seco among the Latin ones," adding, "that his genius was most incl former." Ariosto addresses a beautiful, but somewhat curious Lati Bembo, the burden of which is the supposed infidelity of his mistres the cardinal had remonstrated with the poet against his amorous p and especially against his permitting himself to grieve so inordina instance alluded to. We transcribe the opening lines for the grat the curious in such matters:

AD PETRUM BEMBUM.

Me tacitum perferre mea peccata puellæ?
Me mihi rivalem prænituisse pati?
Cur non ut patiarque fodi mea viscera ferro
Dissimulato etiam, Bembe dolore jubes?
Quin cor, quin oculosque meos, quin erue vel quod
Carius est, siquid carius esse potest.

ity enabled him to build a small house at Ferrara, where ved contentedly, if not luxuriously, employing himself ose studies and compositions which were destined to r his name immortal. On the front of the house near oor, he had the following lines inscribed:

Parva sed apta mihi, sed nulli obnoxia, sed non
Sordida, parta meo sed tamen ære domus.

ll but suitable to me, while hurtful to none; yet not since it is paid for by my own money." It was while s in the same house he got the celebrated arm-chair, , with the equally celebrated inkstand, presented him i first patron and friend, the Cardinal Hippolito, is still seen at Ferrara.* "There," says Shelley, in one of his , "is the arm-chair of Ariosto, an old, plain wooden of furniture, the hard seat of which was once occu- -aye, but has now survived its cushion, as it has its r. I could fancy Ariosto sitting in it; and the , in his own handwriting, which they unfold beside it, ie old bronze inkstand, loaded with figures, which also ged to him, assist the willing delusion. This inkstand n antique rather than ancient appearance. Three hs lean forth from the circumference, and on the lid a cupid, winged, and looking up, with a torch in one his bow in the other, and his quiver beside him."† ie next incident of any note in the life of Ariosto is the of a relative, whose property he claimed as next of There were two other claimants, the duke and a con- The suit was brought to trial three times. Ariosto led twice against the decision of the court; first on the d that the judge was his personal enemy, and secondly

at the generosity of the cardinal was held in grateful remembrance by t, we have numerous proofs in his writings. From several of his Latin , in which he gives expression to his gratitude and affection in one way or we extract the following, not because it is the best, but the briefest. se who think it too laudatory bear in mind that it is natural for us to gher estimate on the qualities of those who have generously befriended a others would:

IN HYPPOLITUM ESTENSEM EPISCOPUM FERRARIÆ.

Excita festivo populi Ferraria plausu,
Protulit ex adytis ora veranda sacris:
Utque sua Hyppolitum prospexit templa tuentum,
—O claros, inquit, gens mea nacta duces!
Quis patre invicto gerit Hercule, fortius arma?
Mystica quis casto costius Hyppolito?

Shelley's Letters, vol. ii.

on the ground of his witnesses having failed to get a hearing. He was about to appeal the third time, when the president of the court intimated to him that if he persisted in his claim he would run the risk of forfeiting the good will of the duke. This hint was sufficient; and the poet had soon reason to believe that Alphonso was well pleased with the course he pursued in thus withdrawing his claim rather than give offence to his patron and friend. Only a few weeks elapsed after he had abandoned his claim when he was appointed as a magistrate to a wild district infested with continual robberies. The most romantic stories are told of his wonderful influence among the robbers; but it is sufficient for us to observe that by one means or other, whether by his poetry or by his prose, he succeeded in a short time in establishing order among the lawless inhabitants.

It seems uncertain whether he was married or not, although it is pretty generally believed that he was privately married to his beautiful mistress, Alessandra, by whom he had two illegitimate sons. We have no account of his having ever openly acknowledged her as his wife, but some of his biographers allege that the reason of this was that he held some ecclesiastical benefices which were incompatible with the married state. To this, however, it is proper to add, that those who had the best opportunities of ascertaining the facts, and whose statements on all other matters affecting the character of Ariosto are most reliable, emphatically deny that he held any such benefices, and his works throughout fully bear out this view of the case—they certainly show that Ariosto was not afraid of speaking of ecclesiastics as he thought they deserved. Even the Pope he did not spare. Because he was disappointed in some patronage he had been expecting for some time from his Holiness, he satirizes him in several sonnets. As one of these is quite amusing, we will glance at it in passing. It describes a householder who, during a severe drought, is fortunate enough to find a spring, which, however, is so scanty that only one can drink out of it at a time. First he quenches his own thirst, then his family quench theirs in turn, then his servants, then his favorites, then herds, flocks, and asses in prodigious numbers. The process was so tedious that a poor magpie, perishing for want of water, thought it would never be at an end. Formerly it used to amuse the finder of the spring with its tricks and chatter. "I have no chance here,

poor mag. at last, "I must seek another foun-

ose who read these satires, or any of them, will hardly te to acquit both Ariosto and those who had benefices ant of having entered into any collusion with each as to whether the former chose to get married or not. s, Sir John Harrington gives us some stories of other with whom the poet was said to have had tender re-. The honest biographer takes the best view he can case. He tries to exculpate Ariosto on the ground of ing a very conscientious person. Finally, when he that the evidence against him is rather strong, ys that, although he may have to decide against uthor of the *Orlando* in those delicate affairs, he lined to pardon him for various reasons, but chiefly e "these white devils have such power upon earth." is, Sir John would have us believe that, if Ariosto ot preserve his virtue as well as he should have it is the fascinations of the ladies we should , and not him who was only their victim. Probably, ladies could be heard on the subject, they too give a pretty plausible excuse for their sins; and this is us of Sir John's quaint description of Tasso's ap-ice. "He was tall," he says, "of person, of complex-elancholy, given much to study and musing, and would vith sometimes forget himself; he was of color like re, somewhat tawny in his face, but fair-skinned other-his hair was black, but he quickly grew bald; his ad was large; his eyebrows thin; his eye a little hol-ut very full of life and very black; his nose was large

---

*"To those, my cousin, this true story tell,
Who think that I shall quaff the sacred well,
For mark what numbers wait to quench their thirst,
From nephews down to fourteenth cousins—first;—
Next—those who lent their hand to mount the throne,
And grace his temples with the triple crown.
One, 'I was with him in his exile,' cries,
'I risked my neck to serve him,' one replies.
A third, advancing on, begins to boast
How much he lent, how much he might have lost.
Another on acknowledgments depends
For favors to his brothers and his friends,
'When neither horse, nor arms, nor clothes remained,
I set him up, and at my cost maintained;'
*'Mid claims like these, neglected I must wait,
And never drink at all, or drink too late.*"

iginal see *Opere Minori*, vol. ii., p. 72.

and hooked (as they say the kings of Persia were); his were white; his cheeks wan; his beard thin; his nec proportioned; his shoulders square and well-made stooping, as almost all that look much over books in youth are inclined to be; his hand somewhat dry, and tle bow-legged. His counterfeit was taken by Titia excellent drawer, so well to the life that a man would it were alive."*

On the return of Ariosto from quelling the distur in Graffignana, he received a safer and more dignified, a more lucrative mark of the duke's favor. The latter, fond of theatrical amusements, had built a splendid th and now appointed the poet director of it, instructing have some of his own plays represented first. If his co were not the first written in verse by an Italian auth more than one or two such had appeared before them. he wrote his dramas first in prose, and then recast the turned them into loose verse. After two of his own had been well received and gained him much credit all classes, he translated two of Terence's plays int for the sake of variety. A good reception was awa these also; but in the other cities of Italy none of hi were so well received. He had predicted himself th would be the case; but Riccoboni admired him so mu he thought nothing emanating from his pen could fai tract large audiences. In this, indeed, he was partly the audiences assembled and were abundantly large, b hissed instead of praising. This was the case at where his *Orlando Furioso* was the delight of young a Riccoboni himself tells us the story in his history Italian theatre. Having made all the preparations he thought necessary, he announced, in the usual man "Scolastica, by Lodovico Ariosto." The name of Ariost like a charm; it brought crowds, of every rank; but disappointed. They had expected to see the Alcir Angelicas, the Olympias, the Orlandos, and the Brad of the *Furioso*. Finding that instead of these they w sented with the traditional vagabonds of the old come would not take the trouble of tracing out the sto tells us that they murmured before the close of the f that about the middle of the second they began to th

* Harrington's Ariosto, p. 421.

ples, so that at the middle of the fourth act he had to let the curtain fall.

He admits, however, that perhaps he was not altogether blameless himself, since he took the liberty of making some important alterations in the play. He tells us that his intentions were good; and there is every reason to believe that they were. Thus, in the original play one of the characters insists on the necessity of going to Naples to fulfil a religious vow, whereas his real object is represented as very different. In the same scene a monk is introduced, who states that he has a bull from the Pope, enabling him to give a dispensation from certain vows, and commute them on condition of some easy penance. All this is amusingly set forth, with some additions which we do not care to note. Riccoboni, feeling satisfied that the monks did not deserve to be satirized, omitted every allusion that might give them offence, or that might offend that part of the audience, who, like himself, felt that no friend of humanity ought to give pain to men who had done so much good for the friendless and poor. It was not the omission of this scene that displeased the Venetians; on the contrary, they subsequently manifested their thanks to Riccoboni for his discretion and sense of right; but having learned, before the play was repeated, that he had done this, they readily believed that he had taken similar liberties with other scenes, and consequently spoiled the whole piece.

The satires of Ariosto, although very good specimens of that style of writing, are so filled with local allusions that foreigners cannot appreciate them; even the Italians of the present day find it difficult to understand them. In this respect, as well as in their trenchant force and purity of style, they are often compared to the comedies of Aristophanes, to which, however, it must be confessed, they are vastly inferior as literary efforts.

Several of Ariosto's biographers tell us that he received the laurel crown from the hands of the emperor Charles V.; nor is there any reason to doubt the fact further than that scarcely any two of them agree in any fact bearing on the ceremony. They differ even as to the town where the ceremony is represented to have taken place—some claiming the honor for Mantua, some for Ferrara, and others for Bologna. The idea likely to occur to any thoughtful reader, in glancing at these rival claims, is that it is a subject scarcely worth disputing about, since the fame and honor of the author of the

Orlando Furioso, as a poet and thinker, are far too great a
too well established at home to be in the least influenced
any ceremony that Charles V., or any other potentate, how
ever illustrious, could perform upon him. Some of his Ital
ian biographers tell us also, that Leo X. published a bull i
favor of the *Orlando*, and excommunicating all who shoul
presume to find fault with it. But none believe this story
any longer; indeed the wonder is that any one ever did.
Ginguené, who has fully investigated the subject, tells
us in his *Histoire Litteraire d'Italie*, that there is no further
foundation for it than that the customary license to print
the book was given by the Pope in the ordinary form.

Ariosto was very fond of gardening, not, we are informed,
because he had any knowledge of it, but that he was fond
of contemplating nature in every form, especially in that
which is most tender. His son Virginio informs us that,
"if he set out a fruit-tree, or sowed seed of any kind, he would
go so often to see if it were growing, that he generally
ended with spoiling or breaking off the bud." This is in strik-
ing contrast with some of the favorite precepts of Ariosto
himself, who used to say that poetry might be compared to
a laurel which sprung up of itself, and which might be great-
ly improved by cultivation, but would lose its natural beau-
ty if too much meddled with. "It is the same way," he added,
"with verses which come into the mind, we know not
how, which may be improved by the correction of a little
original roughness, but are deprived of all their grace and
freshness by too nice a handling."

To a great extent, this is undoubtedly true, but it is much
more applicable to prose than poetry. In writing prose
not only are those the best thoughts, in general, which come
first, but the language used to express them is also the
most appropriate, because the most natural. But in poetry
it is different, because, let theorists say what they will
even poets express themselves more naturally in prose
than in metrical language. There is no one so complete
master of the latter, but that he requires to make some
alterations and omissions in his first effort. Nor has any
one who has written so much, used the pruning-knife oftener
than the author of the *Orlando*.

We have evidence of this in various forms. Thus the
first edition of his great poem was issued in 1516; the sec-
ond did not appear for sixteen years. Any competent per-
son who has compared the two has not failed to perceive

there is an immense difference between them. It lent that he employed this long period in improving his rendering his diction more chaste, more perspicuous, classical—in short, in selecting such epithets and orms of expression as approached nearest to making his ge a perfect mirror of his mind; for there is scarcely a in the original copy which is not more or less altered second edition. If it be true, then, as his son says, that o spoiled fruit-trees and flowers by meddling with them uch, the reverse is true of his meddling with his poetry. ps if all were known, it would be found that Ariosto more about trees and flowers than the son who criti- is treatment of them; since there are some buds which etter broken or "spoiled" than allowed to obtain a growth.

ie exact date of Ariosto's death is not known. Some of ographers say it took place in June; others, that it did ntil July; but all agree in giving the year as 1533. He t Ferrara, and was buried in the church of the Benedic- onks, who treated his remains with every mark of re- evincing their regard even to the extent of suspending their strictest rules, so that they might attend his fune- body. This was the way the good monks showed resentment for the many jokes perpetrated at their ex- by Ariosto, both in his comedies and in his *Orlando.**

---

me idea may be formed of how much they had to forgive in this respect, e following stanzas from the *Furioso*:

"But when the impious Pagan long had heard
That fearless monk descant with small delight,
And bade him turn again, if he preferr'd,
Without her, to his cell, as well he might;
But still no sign of true or peaceful word
Could gain, but unconceal'd and bold despight,
He straightway by the beard, in angry scoff,
Fast seized the man of God, and tore it off.

"Anon, with hand firm as a blacksmith's vice,
He grasp'd his throat, so fierce his fury grew;
And, whirl'd above his head some once or twice,
Right towards the sea aloft the carcass flew.
What happened to him then is matter nice
To judge, midst various rumors false or true;
Some say, how on a rock so batter'd fell he,
That head and foot form'd one continuous jelly.

"While others, that he dropp'd, sound wind and limb,
Souse in the sea, some three miles off and more,
And there was drown'd, not knowing how to swim,
Though offering prayers and vows at least a score.
Others affirm a saint assisted him,
And dragg'd him with his naked hand to shore;
So, whether he were saved, or crush'd, or sunk,
Judge ye, for here my story quits the monk."—C. 29, s. 5.

They had the good sense and true Christian virtue to honor his genius, and forgive his faults. They dealt gently even with his alleged indifference to religion; in this respect they hoped for the best to the last; nor were they disappointed at the close. All agree in the statement that he bore his last sickness with uncommon resolution and serenity, affirming: "that he was willing to die on many accounts, and particularly because he found that the greatest divines were of opinion that we shall know one another in the other world." A day or two before he died, he observed to those around him "that many of his friends were departed whom he desired to visit, and that he thought every moment tedious till he gained that happiness."

This reminds us, by contrast, of a Latin epitaph which he had written in the prime of life, and which he used to say was the only one he wished inscribed on his tomb, if he ever had such. In this religion is entirely ignored. We copy it in a foot-note* for the benefit of those familiar with the Latin, informing those who do not possess that advantage, that it is in substance as follows: "The bones of Ludovico Ariosto are deposited beneath this marble, beneath this sod, or beneath whatever the kind heir, or kinder companion, or passing traveller may find more suitable, for it was not given to him to know the future. Nor, indeed, did he deem his body of so much importance when living that he should wish to prepare an urn for it. He prepared these lines, however, and wished them to be inscribed on his sepulchre (if perchance he should have the like)," &c., &c. It is almost needless to say that this is not the epitaph which appears on Ariosto's tomb. Numbers were written in different lan-

---

* LUDIVICI AREOSTI EPITAPHIUM.

Ludovici Areosti humantur ossa
Sub hoc marmore, seu sub hac humo, seu
Sub quicquid voluit benignus heres;
Sive herede benignior comes, sive
Oportunius incidens viator:
Nam scire haud potuit futura. Sed nec
Tanti erat vacuum sibi cadaver,
Ut urnam cuperet parare vivens.
Vivens ista tamen sibi paravit,
Quæ inscribi voluit suo sepulchro
(Olim si quod haberet is sepulchrum),
Ne cum spiritus, exili peracto
Præscripti spatio, misellus artus,
Quos ægre ante reliquerit, reposcet,
Hac et hac cinerem hunc et hunc revellens,
Dum noscat proprium, vagus pererret.

guages after his death, but the best Latin epitaph was by Father Steffanio, a Jesuit priest, who, however, was not known as the author until the fact was accidently discovered while he was on his death-bed, twenty years after it was written. It is in the true classic spirit; even Virgil or Horace has seldom compressed more thought, or infused more true pathos, into an equal number of lines. We transcribe one of its four stanzas:

Notus et Hesperiis iacet hic Areostus et Indis,
Cui Musa æternum nomen hetrusca dedit.
Seu satyram in vitia exacuit, seu comica lusit,
Seu cecinit grandi bella ducesque tubâ,
Ter summus vates, cui docti in vertice Pindi
Tergeminâ licuit cingere fronde comas:
Quodque magis mirum, indoctis doctisque placere,
Cunctorumque manu noctu dieque teri.
Scilicet hic, Phœbi amplexus decora omnia, quidquid
In variis dulce est vatibus, unus habet.*

Our diminishing space reminds us that it is time now we should take leave of the poet's life, to devote ourselves more particularly to his poetry. In doing so it occurs to us at the outset that Ariosto labored under one great disadvantage in his principal poem, for be it remembered that the *Orlando Furioso* is but the continuation of the *Orlando Innamorato* of Boiardo. There are very few who have succeeded in making such an addition even to their own works; but no "second part" has equalled the first, not even the Odyssey of Homer. All know how much Milton's Paradise Regained is inferior to his first work, the Paradise Lost. The *Orlando Furioso* is, however, vastly superior to the *Orlando Innamorato;* but, in order to understand the former, it is necessary to have some idea of the plot of the latter, since even the *dramatis personæ* are, with a few exceptions, the same in both. We will, therefore, take a brief glance at Boiardo's poem, passing over all that does not seem essentially necessary for our purpose; not, however, without observing that the *Innamorato* is also a fine poem.

The story opens by reminding us that the fame of Orlando's sword, Durianda, and of Rinaldo's horse, Bayardo, had reached the ears of Gradasso, a monarch of India, who had a dragon's face and heart, and was a giant in height. He had

* Here lies Ariosto, whose fame reaches from the West to the East, and to whom the Etruscan muse has given an eternal name. He alternately employed satire against vice; amused himself with the comic, and sung of wars and warriors, in a sublime strain, &c.

long been devising plans to obtain them, and finally resolved o the invasion of France as the only effectual means. At th time he decides on this rash enterprise, Charlemagne, whos fame had also reached India, is holding a solemn tournament a Paris, to which all strangers, whether Christian or Pagan, ar invited. The festival is ushered in with a sumptuous ban quet. The king appears in his royal robes, among twenty two thousand guests from all countries, who are arranged, a nearly as possible, according to their respective ranks. Ri naldo happens to get a position which, at least in his ow estimation, is beneath his rank, and takes offence accord ingly; but his anger creates merriment rather than any seri ous feeling. While he is giving vent to his indignation by threats of vengeance, four giants enter the hall, and betwee them is a young lady of exquisite beauty, followed by a singl knight. She tells the king that herself and her brother ar exiled from their father's house; that in their wanderin they had heard of this festival, and that they have come t win, if possible, the wreath of flowers, which is said to b the guerdon in these tournaments. "My brother," she say "will await all comers at the pillar of Merlin. Should h succeed in unhorsing his adversary, such knight so unscate shall be his prisoner; should my brother be thrown, I a to be the reward of the victor. I am Angelica, and my bro ther is Uberto."

The lady remains kneeling before the king, who scarcel knows what reply to make. The surrounding paladins loo on in silent admiration; the grey-haired Namus feels hi youth returning; Orlando approaches her with downcast eye and the king himself is in love. While all the rest are hesi tating, Ferrau, a paynim knight of Mohammedan Spain resolves on snatching her and running off, but is reminde by one of his followers of what is due to the imperial pre sence. Meantime the lady receives a gracious answer an retires. Malagigi, a magician, suspects that all is not right applies to his book, and conjures up four devils, one o whom informs him that Angelica is sent by her father, Gala fron, King of Cathay, to fascinate, as best she can, the war riors of Charlemagne, and bring them to her father as prison ers. She is as mischievous as possible, and is deeply skille in magic. Her brother, whose true name is Argalia, is person of a similar character. His armor is enchanted, an such is the virtue of his lance, that no knight, howeve brave, can resist its push. Nor is this all; he has a ring

which he has only to put into his mouth to render him invisible, and which possesses the additional virtue of frustrating all enchantments against the person who wears it. But of more value than all, if possible, is his wonderful horse; yet the chief dependence of Galafron is on the fascinations of his daughter. The magician is puzzled how to act; but he has full confidence in his devils, whom he orders to transport him at once to the pavilion of Argalia, near the pillar of Merlin.

By means of his enchantments he throws the giants into a deep sleep, so that he may possess himself of the person of Angelica; but she happens to wear her brother's ring, which effectually protects her from all incantations, even though the devils themselves take part in them. Failing in his attempt, the magician is captured, soundly flogged, deprived of his magical book, and by means of one of the spells in it sent as a prisoner to Cathay. While these things are transpiring at Merlin's Pillar, there is considerable confusion at Paris between the knights, Orlando insisting on having the first encounter with Argalia. In order to end the disputes, it is proposed to draw lots; to this Orlando assents, but Astolpho wins the first chance, and Ferrau the second. The antagonists engage at once, but Astolpho is instantly unhorsed, and surrenders himself as prisoner in accordance with the terms of the tournay. The next day it is Ferrau's turn, and he claims it accordingly. Argalia makes no delay, but meets him at once on his Rabican, a horse blacker than the raven, but with three piebald legs and a star on his forehead. Ferrau is thrown as quickly as Astolpho, but the former refuses to comply with the conditions, on the ground that he is no vassal of Charlemagne's. The giants interpose to enforce the terms, but are beaten back by Ferrau. Argalia attacks him again, but finds he has forgotten his enchanted lance. The combat is continued, however, until one learns that the skin of his opponent is invulnerable, while the latter learns that the arms of the former are enchanted. This leads to a sort of armistice, in which Argalia offers his sister to his antagonist, provided she will accept him. Angelica, who has had a glance at the Spanish knight, thinks him ugly, and consequently declines to marry him. There is no alternative, therefore, but to resume the combat, which is done; but Angelica puts on her magic cloak and transports herself in a twinkling from the scene. Her brother follows her; Ferrau pursues both, but overtakes neither. Astolpho in the meantime finds himself at liberty, and his own lance having been broken in the tournay, he takes

Argalia's, but without any knowledge of its virtues, and returns to Paris. He tells Rinaldo, whom he meets on the way, what occurred. He subsequently meets Orlando, to whom he gives the same information. The latter sets out also in pursuit of Angelica. Meantime the tournament proceeds at Paris, while the king's best knights are away. In their absence, Grondomio, the Pagan giant, seems the most likely to win the coveted wreath; for he has wounded and unhorsed numbers of the Christian knights. At length Astolpho enters the lists, and his enchanted lance soon turns the scale; the giant falls like a tower. The victor loses the honor, however, by treachery; and in his rage thereat attacks friends and foes alike, not sparing even the king, until he is seized and conveyed to prison.

Ferrau, Rinaldo, and Orlando reach the wood of Arden, where Angelica is, by different routes. Rinaldo is the first to arrive, and he finds a beautiful fountain in the forest, the properties of which he little suspects. It had formerly been enchanted by Merlin, the effect of which was that when one in love drank the water, it made him not only forget his passion, but all he had before loved. He was so unfortunate as to drink of it, and although he soon came to another fountain that had opposite properties, he lay down beside it without tasting its waters. While he slept on its banks, Angelica came and drank from it, after which she immediately fell in love with him, pulls a handful of flowers, and throws them on his face. He awakes, looks at her, but runs away in disgust and hatred; she follows in vain pursuit, until, wearied at length, she sinks down on the turf, and weeps herself to sleep. Ferrau arrives next; he meets Argalia; a long combat ensues, in which the former pierces the latter to the heart through a chink in his enchanted armor. The dying warrior begs that his conqueror will throw him, armed as he is, into a neighboring river, so that his memory will not be disgraced by its being known that he has been defeated in enchanted armor. Ferrau consents to throw all in as required save the helmet, and he does so. When Orlando arrives, he finds Angelica sleeping. While admiring her beauty, Ferrau comes up, and taking him for one of the lady's guards, challenges him to combat. He soon recognizes Orlando, and a duel follows, when Angelica takes to flight as usual. Orlando proposes that both follow her, and that they end the combat on recovering her; but Ferrau declines, and the combat is renewed with redoubled fury. Another lady arrives

n a palfrey during the fight, and claims the assistance of
rrau, whom she informs that Spain has been invaded
r Gradasso, and that Marsilius has no other hope
n in the valor of Ferrau. The latter cannot resist the
mand of his sovereign, conveyed, as it is, by a lady; and
cordingly the duel is suspended, with the consent of Or-
do, who is glad of the opportunity to follow Angelica,
ile Ferrau accompanies the fair ambassadress to Spain.
Charlemagne hears of the invasion of Spain, and despatches
naldo to the relief of Marsilius. Rinaldo attacks four
gs in turn, and is successful against each. One of them,
o survives a bloody battle, reports the victory of Rinaldo,
l Gradasso goes forth in person against the conqueror.
naldo is mounted on Bayardo, having little idea that this
d steed is one of the chief causes of the war. The two
riors agree on a single combat, with the conditions that,
Rinaldo conquers, he is to receive back all the prisoners
de by Gradasso, and that if Gradasso wins the day, Bay-
o is to be his. It is arranged that the combat shall take
ce next day. In the meantime, Angelica, who has re-
ned to India, resolves to release the magician Malagigi, in
er that he may mediate between her and Rinaldo. The
ter receives him graciously, but has drunk too deeply of
waters of hatred to give him any favorable reply in re-
d to Angelica. This offends the magician, who deter-
nes to be revenged. He sends one of his devils to Ri-
do, to whom he represents himself as an envoy from Gra-
so, and thereby deceives the former as to the precise hour
the combat. On coming to the field in the morning,
naldo only sees a small bark anchored to the shore, but
n after he meets one of Malagigi's fiends, who has assumed
adasso's form, and combats with him. Rinaldo, making
low with all his force, buries his sword in the sand; the
il, being light of foot, avails himself of the opportunity
s afforded, and makes his escape to the bark. Rinaldo
s after him, but the fiend jumps about from prow to
p, until he finally vanishes in smoke, and the vessel puts
ea with full sail, and, after hovering about for some time,
s anchor near the gardens of the palace.
Meantime Gradasso waits for Rinaldo at the appointed time
l place; nor does he leave till night. Ricciardetto, the
ther of Rinaldo, finding that he does not return, withdraws
army from the camp of Marsilius, and returns to France.
only Gradasso and his followers, but Rinaldo's own friends,

attribute his conduct to cowardice. The one who suffers mos thus far is Marsilius, who is obliged to make peace on any terms and hold Spain as a liegeman of Gradasso. The conqueror marches to Paris, and defeats Charlemagne in his attempt to intercept his course. He disclaims all rights of conquest however, announcing that all he requires is Rinaldo's horse and Orlando's sword, and that Charlemagne and his peers remain his prisoners for one day. The king accepts these terms, and sends to Paris for the horse. Astolpho, who has assumed the command at Paris, receives the messenger with indignation, saying: "Charles has no right to the horse; Gradasso wants him, let him come and fight for him." The challenge is accepted, and the fight takes place. Astolph is still armed with Argalia's lance, and Gradasso is unhorsed. Having thus released all the prisoners, Astolph informs the king that he has to go in search of his cousin Orlando and Rinaldo. Charles does his best to keep him offering the sovereignty of Ireland as an inducement, but in vain. Orlando had wandered as far as the Tanais in search of Angelica, but got no tidings of her. Finally he and a sphinx where she dwells, who informs him that the place of her residence is Albracca, and asks him questions in return, telling him that not to solve her riddles is death. The Orlando does not understand, but in order to obviate danger cuts her in two with his enchanted sword, Duianda, and then reads the solution of the riddle from a book found on her person.

He comes to a river, along the banks of which he rides until he comes to a bridge kept by a giant, who informs him that it is the bridge of death. "May be so," says Orlando, killing him with his magic sword; but as the giant falls he touches a spring, and a net of iron closes on the hero, beats the sword out of his hand, and leaves him a helpless captive. A friar comes up and preaches a sermon but Orlando takes offence at his doing so. While the friar is trying to convince him of the error of his ways, a Cyclop appears, takes up Orlando's sword, and with it hews the friar to pieces. Then ensues a fight between the giant and Orlando, but the latter conquers. He now proceeds to Albracca, but meets a lady who offers him an enchanted cup, and under the fascination of the draught, he follows her to a wonderful palace. Meantime certain other lovers of Angelica besiege her father's capital. She tries to liberate Orlando from his captivity in the enchanted castle, and he slays

r persecutor. The charm which had attached her to aldo still operates, and she persuades Orlando to accom- y her to France in search of him. On returning ugh the forest of Arden, she drinks from the fountain of ed, while Rinaldo drinks of the fountain of love. Orlan- and Angelica arrive in France in due time, and a combat es place between the former and Rinaldo for the lady. The y disappears as usual, while the two knights (cousins) are ting for her, and runs wildly through the country, where meets with a camp, which proves to be that of Charlemagne, o is at war with Agramont, the King of Africa, who has in- ed France. Charlemagne consigns her to the care of Na- s, Duke of Bavaria, as the best means of ending the quarrel ween the rival lovers; for he promises that she shall be reward of him who preforms the best service in the first tle against the Saracens.

We have now reached the point at which the action of *Orlando Furioso* commences. The most serious fault of sto's great poem is that it requires all this preliminary lanation to understand it. Of course, a work of such a racter can have no unity. But be it remembered that sto did not intend to celebrate any one great action ough the instrumentality of any one hero. This indeed evident from the poem itself, which exhibits characters l personages of every conceivable kind, including kings, oes, knights, magicians, hermits, shepherds, peasants, ens, ladies, enchantresses, female warriors, abandoned ers, fairies, demons, giants, flying horses, elysian gardens, rfs, &c., &c. In short, it is not necessary to examine the m at all in order to see that the author did not mean to te any such single action as that of the Iliad or the eid, if we will only believe what he tells us himself in very first stanza of the poem;

> Le donne i cavalier, l'arme, gli amori
> Le cortesie, l'audaci imprese io canto, &c.*

Ariosto does not commence like Homer, Virgil, Tasso, or lton, announcing a single action or circumstance as the undwork of his poem; on the contrary, he prepares reader for this prodigious variety which he may expect in poem. At the same time, as already observed, a distinct n prevails throughout the whole. The *Orlando* has three

* Dames, knights and arms and love; the deeds that spring
From courteous minds and venturous feats, I sing!

leading subjects, namely, the strange madness of Orlando the adventures of the knights engaged in repelling the Moorish invasion of France, and the marriage of Roger with Bradamant, the ancestress of the house of Este. Each of these has its subordinate incidents, its episodes, its enchantments, &c.

In the analysis of Boiardo's poem we have left Angelica in the care of Namus, to be given to Orlando or Rinaldo, according as one or the other might prove the most valiant in the first battle against the infidel invaders of France. The lady foreseeing the issue of the conflict makes her escape to a neighboring wood, where she meets a "horseless cavalier" in full armor with his shield on his arm. We are told that he runs through the forest more lightly than a half-clothed peasant running for a rustic prize; she becomes frightened on seeing him, and her fright and agitation are compared to those of a shepherd girl who has been startled by the sight of a snake. The knight acting thus strangely is Rinaldo, who has lately drunk of the fountain of love; the reason why Angelica avoids him is that she has drunk at the fountain of hatred about the same time. So anxious is she to make her escape that she allows her palfrey to take what direction he chooses. On reaching the banks of a river she meets Ferrau, the Spanish infidel, who, it will be remembered, has previously fought for her in the poem of Boiardo, and has slain her brother Argalia. He had come to the river to take a drink of water, using his helmet as a cup. The helmet has fallen into the stream, and he was trying to recover it when he was startled by the cries of Angelica, of whom Rinaldo was in close pursuit. A combat between the knights ensues, as a matter of course, and while they are engaged the lady escapes *ex more*. Rinaldo proposes a truce, so that both may pursue her and end the combat on recovering her; the suggestion is adopted by Ferrau, on whose horse both ride together. They pursue her in vain until they come to a place where the road branches in two directions. Here they part without any more fighting. Ferrau, after wandering awhile in the forest, finds himself at the very spot on the banks of the river whence he had started. Meantime the ghost of Argalia has possessed himself of the lost helmet, and determined to keep it, assuring Ferrau that he can find helmets enough in the world that will do him just as well—"There," said he, "is Rinaldo's or Orlando's; either will do admirably."

"Bristled the Paynim's every hair at view,
Of that grim shade uprising from the tide,
And vanished was his fresh and healthful hue,
While on his lips the half-formed accents died.
Next hearing Argalia, whom he slew,
(So was the warrior knight,) that stream beside,
This his unknightly breach of promise blame.
He burned all over, flushed with rage and shame."

'errau swears, in his indignation, by his mother's life that ill never put a helmet on his head, until he has won ido's. Angelica, imagining that she is still pursued by do, is flying frantically all the time through the forest. the description of her flight is admirable will be suffi-ly evident from the following fragment:

"As a young roe or fawn, or fallow deer,
Who needs the shelter of its native glade,
Has seen a hungry pard or tiger tear
The bosom of its bleeding dam, dismayed,
Bounds through the forest green, in ceaseless fear
Of the destroying beast, from shade to shade;
And, as each sapling touched, amid its pangs,
Believes itself between the monster's fangs.

"One day and night and half the following day,
The damsel wanders wide, nor whither knows;
Then enters a deep wood, whose branches play,
Moved lightly by the freshening breeze which blows.
Through this two clear and murmuring rivers stray,
Upon their banks a fresher herbage grows,
While the twin streams their passage slowly clear
Their music with the stones, and please the ear."

Were we to proceed much longer with the analysis of the , we should have no room for such specimens as would the reader a correct idea of its merits, so far as a tolerably translation like that of Rose can be said to do so. All ntended in this respect was to aid the reader to under-the structure of the poem, and the nature of the action, her of the several actions, which it celebrates. If some-of this kind were not done, the *Furioso* could not be nderstood without a previous perusal of the *Innamorato*. hen the plan of the latter is known, together with the s of its principal *dramatis personæ*, the reader easily be-s acquainted with those of the former. We have occu-much more space with the analysis than we should wish, se we should rather give specimens of this author's ies than to make allusions to them, or attempt to be the incidents or situations in which they occur. he best food has to be cooked before it can be relished

as such; and those who are most intelligent in other res require some aid from the lapidary, in order to be a distinguish the true gem from its spurious imitation. ing thus said as much about the structure of the poem think necessary to give a tolerably correct idea of the au general plan, we shall now proceed to give such extra we think best calculated to give a true impression (whole, not only as a work of art, but also as a sou pleasure and instruction, making such observations or passage as we think necessary or desirable. We only the reader to bear two other facts in mind; one is, that poem of Boiardo the chief subject is the love of Or whereas the chief subject in that of Ariosto is the madı Orlando. This, like almost every other view of the poem, is denied by some critics. Thus, for example, v told by Ginguené that "the groundwork of the Furioso amours and exploits of Rogero and Bradamant; the lov folly of Orlando form its principal accessory. To the joined other exploits, other amours, heroic achievement gallant adventures of a host of dames, and knights—a ture which essentially constitutes the romantic epic, an tinguishes it from the epopee, properly so called."*

As so much has been said of the comparative me Ariosto and Tasso, we will here give an extract fron part of the sixth canto of the *Orlando* of which Tasso d scruple to avail himself to a considerable extent in his (ous description of the gardens of Armida. We sele passage all the more readily, because we have given the description of the enchantress herself in another place:

"A more delightful place, wherever hurled
Through the whole air Rogero had not found;
And had he ranged the universal world,
Would not have seen a lovelier in his round;
Than that, where, wheeling wide, the courser furled
His spreading wings, and lighted on the ground,
'Mid cultivated plain, delicious hill,
Moist meadow, shady bank, and crystal rill;

"Small thickets, with the scented laurel gay,
Cedar and orange, full of fruit and flower,
Myrtle and palm, with interwoven spray,
Pleached in mixed modes, all lovely, form a bower;
And, breaking with their shade the scorching ray,
Make a cool shelter from the noon-tide hour.
And nightingales among those branches wing
Their flight, and safely amorous descants sing.

* Histoire Lit. d'Italie. Par P. L. Ginguené, tome iv., p. 384

"Amid red roses and white lilies *there*,
Which the soft breezes freshen as they fly,
Secure the cony haunts and timid hare,
And stay, with branching forehead broad and high.
These, fearless of the hunter's dart or snare,
Feed at their ease, or ruminating lie;
While, swarming in those wilds, from tuft or steep,
Dun deer or nimble goat disporting leap."—6. 20.

Still more beautiful, if possible, is the description of the ince and interior of the enchanted city in the same canto; also one of the best specimens of Rose's translation:

"Above, a cornice round the gateway goes,
Some deal projecting from the colonnade,
In which is not a single part but glows
With rarest gems of India overlaid.
Propp'd at four points, the portal did repose
On columns of one solid diamond made.
Whether what met the eye was false or true,
Was never sight more fair or glad to view.

"Upon the sill, and through the columns there,
Ran young and wanton girls in frolic sport;
Who haply yet would have appeared more fair,
Had they observed a woman's fitting port.
All are arrayed in green, and garlands wear
Of the fresh leaf. Him, these in courteous sort,
With many proffers and fair mien, entice,
And welcome to this opening paradise.

"For so with reason I this place may call,
Where, it is my belief, that Love had birth,
Where life is spent in festive game and ball,
And still the passing moments fleet in mirth.
Here, hoary-headed Thought ne'er comes at all,
Nor finds a place in any bosom. Dearth,
Nor yet Discomfort, never enter here,
Where Plenty fills her horn throughout the year.

"Here, where with jovial and unclouded brow,
Glad April seems to wear a constant smile,
Troop boys and damsels; one, where fountains flow,
On the green margin sings in dulcet style;
Others, the hill or tufted tree below,
In dance, or in no mean sport, the hours beguile,
While this, who shuns the reveller's noisy cheer,
Tells his love sorrows in his comrade's ear.

"Above the laurel and the pine-tree's height,
Through the tall beech and shaggy fir-tree's spray,
Sport little loves, with desultory flight:
These, at their conquests made, rejoiced and gay:
These, with their well-directed shafts, take sight
At hearts; and those spread nets to catch their prey:
One wets his arrows in the brook which winds,
And one on whirling-stone the weapon grinds."—8. 71.

All these descriptions and many more arise from the c duct of Rogero. Hence it is that several critics, includ Ginguené, maintain that Rogero, not Orlando, is the her the *Furioso*, so that the marriage of the former with Bra mant, the ancestress of the house of Este, is the final obj of the poem. It cannot be denied that there is some gro for that opinion. If the personage whose conduct insp the happiest descriptions and the most beautiful portrait can be said to be the hero on those grounds, then undo edly Rogero will have quite as good a claim to that dist tion as Orlando. But the poet has endowed the latter v much greater prowess than the former; or than any o mortal. Nor has he failed to illustrate, in various ways, difference between them in this respect. Thus, for ex ple, he confers on Orlando the honor of killing the sea m ster after he has failed Rogero even with the aid of his fl horse, which enabled him to descend and ascend and st the monster when opportunity most favored him. Rog indeed saves the lady devoted to be eaten, but is power to destroy the monster. It will be remembered that lady so devoted is Angelica, who has been captured pirates, who resolve to dispose of her in this cruel way. there is not a more admirable passage in the whole po than the description of Angelica in this situation, we cop portion of it here from Rose's translation, giving a stanz two of the original at the bottom of the page, so that th familiar with the Italian may be able to appreciate the ference between the author and his translator, even when latter is most successful, as in the present case:

"The cruel and inhospitable crew
To the voracious beast the dame expose
Upon the sea-beat shore, as bare to view
As nature did at first her work compose.
Not even a veil she has, to shade the hue
Of the white lily and vermilion rose,
Which mingled in her lovely members meet,
Proof to December snow and July heat.

"Her would Rogero have some statue deem'd
Of alabaster made, or marble rare,
Which to the rugged rock so fasten'd seemed
By the industrious sculptor's cunning care,
But that he saw distinct a tear which stream'd
Amid fresh-opening rose and lily fair,
Stand on her budding paps beneath in dew,
And that her golden hair dishevell'd flew.

"And as he fastened *his* on *her* fair eyes,
His Bradamant he called to mind again.
Pity and love in his bosom rise
At once, and ill he can from tears refrain:
And in soft tone he to the damsel cries,
(When he has check'd his flying courser's rein,)
'O lady, worthy but that chain to wear,
With which Love's faithful servants fettered are,

"'And most unworthy this or other ill,
What wretch has had the cruelty to wound
And gall those snowy hands with livid stain,
Thus painfully with griding fetters bound?'
At this she cannot choose but show like grain
Of crimson spreading on an ivory ground;
Knowing those secret beauties are espied,
Which, howsoever lovely, shame would hide;

"And gladly with her hands her face would hood,
Were they not fastened to the rugged stone;
But with her tears (for this at least she could)
Bedew'd it, and essay'd to hold it down.
Sobbing some while the lovely damsel stood;
Then loosed her tongue, and spake in feeble tone;
But ended not; arrested in mid-word,
By a loud noise which in the sea was heard.

"Lo! and behold! the unmeasured beast appears,
Half surging and half hidden, in such sort
As sped by roaring wind long carack steers
From north or south, towards her destined port.
So the sea-monster to his food repairs:
And now the interval between is short.
Half dead the lady is through fear endured,
He by that other's comfort reassured."*

Rogero, indeed, does all in his power to kill the monster;

---

* La fiera gente inospitale e cruda
Alla bestia crudel nel lito espose
La bellissima donna cosi ignuda,
Come natura prima la compose.
Un velo non ha pure, in che richiuda
I bianchi gigli e le vermiglie rose,
Da non cader per luglio o per dicembre,
Di che son sparse le polite membre.

Credesto avria che fosse statua finta
O d'alabastro o d'altri marmi illustri
Ruggiero, e sullo scoglio cosi avvinta
Per artificio di scultori industri;
Se non vedea la lacrima distinta
Fra fresche rose e candidi ligustri
Far rugiadose le crudette pome,
E l'aura sventolar l'aurate chiome.—c. x. s. 95.

but his efforts are in vain. The fruitless struggle is fin described by the poet:

"Rogero thus, with sword and spear pursues,
Not where his teeth and threatening tusk he views:
But twixt his ears the threatening blow descends;
Now on his back, now where the tail extends.
Oft as the monster turns aside he flies,
And watches when to sink, and when to rise:
But all in vain, his labor nought avails,
No steel can pierce the impenetrable scales."

In Orlando the monster has quite a different enemy; soon as he is attacked by him, his fate is sealed. Orlan has but little trouble in giving him his death-blow, and h ing done so, he drags him in triumph to the shore.

"—Firmly fixed upon, upon the rock he stood,
And strained each nerve while struggling through the flood,
The monster followed *by that arm compelled,*
Whose strength the strength of mortal man excelled."

Many other passages might be quoted to show t there is much in the character of Orlando which is similar that of Ajax. Nay, some of the poet's admirers go so fa to maintain that Orlando combines the enormous stren and gloomy stubbornness of that hero; the magnanim generosity and noble heroism of Hector, and the fierce ra ity and irresistible impetuosity of Achilles. This, h ever, is but another instance of the exaggeration used by disputants on both sides; nor does it prevent Gingu from persisting in the theory that Rogero is the hero of the Furioso. "L'Arioste," he says "en courte delicat n'annonca pas d'abord son projet; il ne donna po pour titre à son poeme le nom de Roger, que toutes branches de la famille d'Este regardaient comme leur sou commune; il n'en parla pour ainsi dire qu'accidentelleme dans son invocation addressee au Cardinal Hippolite. une méthode qui lui est particulière, tout son début exp dans un ordre rétrograde, les matières qu'il doit embrasse All this is plausible enough; but it can hardly be regarded any one who has carefully read the poem, as setting aside superior prowess of Orlando and the other facts to which have alluded in relation to the same theory. As for the t we do not place so much stress upon it as the champion the opposite theory do. Homer, for example, has not ca his great poem "The Wrathful Achilles," nor has he called Odyssey "The Cunning Ulysses." Virgil, it is true, has ac

[o] Hist. Litt. d'Italie, tome 3, p. 37.

rently in bestowing on his great poem the name of his
; but Tasso has not, neither has Milton.
mong other charges made against Ariosto by his detrac-
, is that of his borrowing extensively from his predeces-
. That he has availed himself of the thoughts of others,
any instances, is very true, but it would be difficult to
e that he has done so more than other poets of the first
. We do not know that Homer has imitated other
s, because his own great poems are the most ancient
nt, save those of the sacred writers. But judging from
ogy, it is more than probable that he availed himself, to
ight extent, of the ancient ballads, if there existed no
e pretentious works anterior to his time; for the Iliad
the Odyssey exhibit an amount of knowledge and in-
ation on multifarious subjects which genius alone could
account for. That Shakespeare, the greatest of modern
s, has borrowed extensively—often adopting whole pas-
s from his predecessors with scarcely the change of a
l, is known to every intelligent student. That Milton has
owed not only from Homer, Virgil, and Dante, but also
the Anglo-Saxon poet Cædmon, a monk of Whitby, who
about 680, is equally known to those who take the pains to
stigate such matters. Has not Virgil imitated Homer
ughout the Æneid? Camoens, the most original of
ern epic poets, has borrowed largely from Virgil; while
te has drawn many of his most sublime ideas from the
s source. Tasso has borrowed at least as much
riosto. Who that has read Horace in connection with
r classic writers who preceded him, is not aware that he
verywhere availed himself of the beauties of Anacreon,
pho, Simonides, and Pindar. Terence has helped him-
with equal freedom to the beauties of Menander.
o these undying names we might add those of every wri-
f acknowledged genius; but far be it from us to charge
of them with plagiarism. None of them needed anything
he kind; the truth is, that none imitate more than
of genius, although the fact is seldom remem-
d. It is the province of the poet, especially
nitate*—to imitate whatever is great or noble in nature or
If a man of genius reads a work of genius, particular
ages make so deep an impression on his mind that he can
er forget them. They recur to him not as borrowed
ies, but as original thoughts of his own. Accordingly, he

* See Aristotle's *Poetics*, chap. XXV.

often uses them when writing, perfectly unconscious that the could be claimed by or for any other writer. With t dull reader it is altogether different. To him all passages are alike; for none make such impressions upon him would enable him to recal them at the moment of nee still less could he use them appropriately, or without rende ing it evident to the most careless reader possessed of an taste that he did not come honestly by them. It is idle t censure a great thinker, especially a poet, because there ar some passages in his writings which are identical, or nearly so with those found in other works. We do not, indeed, apply these observations to the host of so-called poets of the present day who have not an idea of their own, but imagine they can render themselves immortal by the most slavish imitation of some poet, whom they regard as popular or successful. But those who can, not only equal, but often surpass those from whom they borrow, cannot justly be censured as borrowers for the reasons already given. Thus, for example, Ariosto is charged with having borrowed certain passages from Statius and Claudian, as well as from Boiardo and others; but there is not one, save Homer or Virgil, whom he has not greatly surpassed. Even these he certainly equals in some respects in the discrimination and portraiture of character he has no rival. He is more happy in describing external nature and personal accomplishments than the characteristics of the mind, the disposition, and the sympathies; yet, no poet has given us finer specimens of the tender and pathetic. Evidence of this could be furnished from almost any canto in the *Furioso*, but let it suffice now to subjoin two or three stanzas from Orlando's lament for the loss of Angelica, which is as striking and natural a picture of the grief and despair of love can be found in any poem whatever, ancient or modern:

"Without me, my sweet life, beshrew me, where
Art thou bestowed, so beautiful and young!
As some lost lamb, what time the daylight fair
Shuts in remains the wildering woods among
And goes about lamenting here and there,
Hoping to warn the shepherd with her tongue;
Till the wolf hear from far the mournful strain,
And the sad shepherd weep for her in vain.

"My hope, where art thou, where? In doleful wise
Dost thou, perchance, yet rove thy lonely round?
Art thou, indeed, to ravening wolf a prize,
Without thy faithful Roland's succor found?
And is the flower, which, with the deities,
Me, in mid heaven had placed, which, not to wound,
(So reverent was my love) thy feelings chaste,
I kept untouched, alas! now plucked and waste?

"If this fair flower be plucked, oh, misery! oh,
Despair! what more is left me but to die?
Almighty God, with every other woe
Rather than this, thy wretched suppliant try.
If this be true, these hands the fatal blow
Shall deal, and doom me to eternity.
Mixing his plaints with bitter tears and sighs,
So to himself the grieved Orlando cries."—C. vii. s. 76.

One more extract and we take leave of Tasso for the present, although not without expressing the hope that we will soon have an American edition of Rose's translation of his great work. If it has ever been printed in this country in any form we are not aware of the fact; and the same remark will apply to Dante's *Divina Commedia*, Tasso's *Gerusalemme*, and Camoens' *Lusiad*. We feel certain that if handsome editions of these various *chefs d'œuvre* were presented to the American people, they would fully requite the publisher for his enterprise and spirit in doing so. We can assure all concerned that no better means could be adopted to improve the public taste; it would also have the effect of removing many prejudices now existing as to the comparative encouragement given to literature by republics and so-called despotisms. We would make the suggestion in particular to those spirited publishers of the Modern Athens, who are as much distinguished for their friendly and encouraging attention to the muses as they are for their general discrimination and taste as public caterers. For our own part we will do all we can to make the American people acquainted with those sublime geniuses. We have had articles on each already, but only introductory ones. In future papers we will give copious extracts, selecting, however, those that are most characteristic, and giving our impressions of their beauties. None admire the principal British poets more than we do; or those of our own poets who have any just claim to the title. We do not discuss the merits of either as much as we do those of foreign poets, chiefly because we prefer to tell our readers something they do not know rather than what they are already familiar with, but partly because great poets are so few that they must be sought for in different countries; in the ancient as well as in the modern world.

Now to our closing extract; and where there is such a profusion of beauties of various kinds, it is difficult to make a selection. It is generally admitted that even the imagination has seldom indulged a stranger or more capricious flight than that of Astolpho to the moon in search of the

lost wits of Orlando. This we had marked as an instance of the peculiarly happy manner in which playfulness and sublimity are combined in the *Furioso*. The story of this curious journey embraces some sixteen stanzas of the most exquisite poetry; but a fragment of it could give no idea of the merits of the episode as a whole. We must, therefore, content ourselves with a shorter piece; although this, too, is a fragment—we mean the concluding stanzas of the description of Rogero's combat with Rodomont, which also concludes the poem. Those who read this carefully, even in a translation, will hardly think it exaggeration to say that in describing the exploits and achievements of his heroes, as well as in the delineation of character Ariosto is inimitable:

"Rogero at his vizor doth present
His naked poniard's point, with threatening cry
That he will slay him, save he yields, content
'To let him live, if he for grace apply.'
But Rodomont, who rather than be shent
For the least deed of shame, preferred to die,
Writhed, struggled, and with all his vigor tried
To pull Rogero down, but naught replied.

"As mastiff that below the deer-hound lies,
Fixed by the gullet fast, with holding bite,
Sorely bestirs himself and vainly tries,
With lips besmeared with foam and eyes alight,
And cannot from beneath the conqueror rise,
Who foils his foe by force, and not despite;
So vainly strives the monarch of Argier
To rise from underneath the cavalier.

"Yet Rodomont so twists and strives, he gains
The freedom of his better arm anew;
And with the right hand which his poniard strains,
For he had drawn his deadly dagger too,
Would wound Rogero underneath the reins:
But now the wary youth the error knew
Through which he might have died, by his delay
That impious Saracen forthwith to slay;

"And smiting twice or thrice his horrid front,
Raising as high as he could raise in air
His dagger, buried it in Rodomont;
And freed himself withal from further care,
Loosed from the more than icy corse, to font
Of fetid Acheron, and hell's foul repair,
The indignant spirit fled, blaspheming loud;
Erewhile on earth so haughty and so proud."

ART. II.—1. *Théorie de la Lune, deduite de seul principe de l'attraction.* Par M. CLAIRANT. Paris, 1842.

The Principia. By SIR ISAAC NEWTON. London, 1814.

Selenotopographische Fragmente zur genauern Kenntniss der Mondflaeche, &c. Von J. H. SCHROETER. Gottingæ, 1802.

Fundamenta nova Investigationis orbitæ veræ quam luna perlustrat, &c. P. A. HANSEN. Gothæ, 1838.

Théorie du Mouvement de la Lune. Par T. MAYER. Turin, 1832.

Cosmos; a Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe. By ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLT. London, 1861.

IT has frequently occurred in the history of science that searches undertaken for a special purpose, although fruitless as to the end for which they were instituted, have led to unexpected and interesting results. As examples of this fact we might cite some of the most important discoveries of Bradley, Olbers and Sir William Herschel. The earliest instance, however, is that of certain astronomical observations made at Babylon more than seven centuries before the Christian era. These observations, recorded by the Chaldean priests for astrological purposes, survived the dissolution of successive empires, and, after a lapse of 2,500 years, afforded data for establishing one of the most remarkable inequalities in the motion of our satellite.

The time occupied by the moon in completing a revolution round the earth, or the interval which elapses from her leaving a fixed star till she again returns to it, is 27d. 7h: 43m. 11½s. This, however, is not the period in which she passes through her series of changes. The latter, which is denominated a lunar month, or synodical period, is the time from one new moon to another, or the interval between two consecutive conjunctions with the sun. Its length is found by observation to be 29d. 12h. 44m. 2·87s. On account, however, of the sun's disturbing influence this interval is not always precisely the same. The *mean* synodic period—that is, the average length of a great number of consecutive revolutions—was determined by Dr. Halley, as accurately as possible, from modern observations alone. But from the eclipses observed at Babylon, about 720 B. C., he was enabled to ascertain the mean motion at that remote epoch; and, on comparing the ancient with the modern observations, the periodic time was found to have diminished. Again, from the

works of Albategnius, an Arabian astronomer of the ninth century, it was perceived that at the date of *his* observations the moon's time of revolution was *less* than the ancient, but *greater* than the modern period. Halley accordingly inferred that the mean motion had been continually accelerated from the time of the first eclipses recorded at Babylon. At the period of this discovery (1693) the longitudes of the points from which the ancient observations had been made were not accurately known; the precise value of the acceleration could not therefore be given. Subsequently, however, the situations of those places were more exactly ascertained, which enabled Dunthorne (1749) not only to verify the *fact* of Halley's discovery, but also to determine the *quantity* by which the lunar period had diminished.

This anomaly was regarded by the scientific world with extraordinary interest. During the long interval between the time of its discovery and that of its physical explanation by Laplace, in 1787, it was the subject of much learned and ingenious speculation. Of the numerous hypotheses proposed for its explanation we may instance the following:

That the mass of the sun is gradually diminished by the emission of the particles of light. The effect of such a diminution of the attractive force by which the earth is retained in its orbit, would be an increase in the length of the year. This would make the sun's apparent motion in the ecliptic slower, and consequently the moon would require less time to gain one entire revolution; in other words, the synodic month would be shortened. Another conjecture was, that the earth's velocity of rotation had, from some cause, been slightly retarded; in which case the length of the day would be increased, and hence the moon's period *apparently* shortened.* Others supposed

*This hypothesis was, at one time, regarded with favor by the celebrated Rittenhouse. "We do not certainly know," he remarked, "whether that apparent acceleration of the moon's motion, which Mayer, with other great astronomers, has admitted, ought to be attributed to a real increase of velocity in the moon, or to a diminution of the earth's diurnal motion. If to the former, the destruction of this beautiful and stupendous fabric may from thence be predicted, with more certainty than from any other appearance in nature. But if to the latter, it may be prettily accounted for by Dr. Halley's ingenious hypothesis concerning the change of variations in the magnetic needle. The Doctor supposes the internal crust or shell of the earth to contain a nucleus detached from it, and that the impulse which first caused the diurnal motion was given to the external parts, and from thence in time communicated to the internal nucleus, by means of an intervening fluid, but not so as perfectly to equal the velocity of the superficial parts of the globe. Whence it

hat a resisting medium diminished the moon's centrifugal rce, and thus lessened its period. The insufficiency of ravity alone to account for the phenomenon was generally mitted.

A thorough investigation of this perplexing and mysteri- problem was at length undertaken by the celebrated La- ce. It was well known that the orbit of the earth is ellipse, with the sun in one of the foci; that, in con- quence of the sun's disturbing influence, the mean dis- ce and period of the moon are greater than they would independently of such disturbance; that the solar rturbation is greatest when the earth is nearest the sun, l least when it is most remote; and, finally, that any va- tion in the form of the earth's orbit would affect the ount of the sun's disturbing force, and thus produce a nge *of some kind* in the moon's periodic time. The ques- n, therefore, which presented itself for Laplace's consid- tion was—Has the form of the earth's orbit been actually nging for the last three thousand years?—if so, has the riation been such as to harmonize with the observed short- ing of the lunar period, and can it be shown to result as ecessary consequence from the law of universal gravita- n? To test this interesting question, the amount of dis- bance produced by the principal members of the system s carefully determined. The result proved that the ec- tricity of the earth's orbit is slowly diminishing; that r planet's perihelion distance is therefore *increasing*, and disturbance of the moon's motion by the solar attraction *reasing*; that this gradual *opening out* of the earth's orbit been going on for many thousands of years; and finally, t its rate is such as to account satisfactorily for the accel- tion of the moon's mean motion. The great difficulty s therefore resolved, and the Newtonian law of gravita- n completely vindicated.

The rate of variation of the terrestrial orbit is such that while the major axis remains always the same—the *peri- ion distance* increases about thirty-nine and a half miles ry year; in other words, the sun annually approaches

---

follow, that the external shell of the earth is still communicating motion he internal parts, and losing motion itself proportionably. The diurnal ion must, therefore, become slower and slower, yet can never be retarded, his cause, beyond certain limits, nor can we conceive that any inconve- ce will follow."—*Address delivered before the American Philosophical ty in* 1775.

that much nearer the centre of the ellipse. The orbit
this rate would become a circle in about 40,000 years. Th
event, however, can never take place. Leverrier has fou
that the *minimum* eccentricity (one-fifth of the present valu
will be reached in rather less than 24,000 years. Unti
therefore, this limit is attained, the acceleration of the moon
motion must continue. The changes, however, will th
be reversed. The terrestrial orbit will again by slow d
grees become more and more elliptical, which must pr
duce, in turn, a *retardation* of the mean motion of our sa
ellite. The period of this cycle of changes, though calc
lable, has not yet been determined. It is measured, ho
ever, by thousands of centuries.

The question as to whether the transmission of gravi
is instantaneous or successive, was also considered by L
place in connection with that of the secular acceleration
the moon's mean motion. Did gravity require *time* for i
transmission, a degree of velocity might be assigned whi
would account for the shortening of the moon's period. B
as the latter phenomenon was demonstrated by Laplace
depend almost wholly on the cause which he assigned, "
*must suppose that the gravitating fluid has a velocity which is
least a hundred millions of times greater than that of light.*" *

The theory of the moon is not merely a subject of spe
ulative interest; as a matter of practical importance it
scarcely surpassed in the entire range of physical researc
This is obvious from the fact of its indispensable conne
tion with the science of navigation. The first person wh
suggested the practicability of finding the longitude at s
by observing the distance of the moon from the sun or
given fixed star, was John Werner, of Nuremberg, who
published recommendation of this method dates as early a
1514. Again, Kepler, and other astronomers of the si
teenth and seventeenth centuries, recommended the inve
tigation of the lunar motions for the same purpose. At thi
time, however, no instruments had been constructed b
which small angular distances could be measured with suf
cient precision to render this mode available in practic
But the great difficulty to be overcome was the imperfe
tion of the lunar theory itself. The constant danger t
which property and life were exposed in the prosecution
long voyages, induced enlightened governments to offer lar

* Mec. Cel., vol. iv., p. 645.

rewards for the construction of tables representing the moon's place, with such exactness as to enable navigators to determine their longitude. Philip the Third of Spain, in 1598, promised a recompense of 100,000 crowns; the Dutch soon after proposed a reward of 30,000 florins; in 1714, the Parliament of Great Britain passed a bill granting 20,000 pounds sterling as a compensation to the person who should solve this difficult and important problem. Finally, the Regent Duke of Orleans, in 1716, offered 100,000 francs for the same purpose. These rewards, the high distinction to be won by the successful competitor, and the intrinsic importance of the subject itself, could not fail to attract the earnest consideration of astronomers and mathematicians. Tobias Mayer, of Gottingen, computed the first tables which had the required accuracy. He accordingly sent them to London (1755) and claimed the offered prize. They were submitted to the astronomer royal to be examined, and compared with observation. This was a work, however, requiring considerable time; and the young astronomer, exhausted by intense application, had passed beyond the reach of earthly rewards before the decision was given in his favor. His widow received a part of the recompense offered by Parliament—an equal part being at the same time awarded to Euler, to whose labors Mayer had been largely indebted.

But, notwithstanding the vast labor with which the moon's motions had been observed and discussed, the best lunar tables, at the middle of the present century, were sometimes in error as much as thirty seconds. A careful examination of the longest and most trustworthy series of observations afforded the only prospect of detecting the source of these discrepancies and securing their elimination. A complete discussion of the Greenwich observations, from 1750 to 1830, was accordingly undertaken by Mr. Airy, the astronomer royal. A corps of assistant computers, sometimes sixteen in number, were employed eight years in completing the calculations; the expense to the British Government amounting to $21,500. These immense labors led to the discovery, by Airy and Hansen, of several new inequalities in the lunar motions, which, "when applied to the moon's computed longitude, completely account for the errors in the tables which had so long perplexed the astronomers of Europe. The lunar theory may, therefore, now be considered as divested of all serious embarrassment; and in

its present state it undoubtedly constitutes one of tl
blest monuments of intellectual research which the
of science offer to our contemplation."*

It is a remarkable coincidence, that while the volu
the sun is sixty-four million times greater than that
satellite, their *apparent* magnitudes are almost exact
same. The fact that the moon, with a single excepti
incomparably the most conspicuous of the heavenly b
her rapid change of position among the fixed stars, a
nightly increase or diminution of her illuminating
have in all ages attracted attention to her phenomer
is readily perceived without telescopic aid, that all p
the lunar disk have not the same degree of brightness.
is, however, a very striking contrast between the appe
as seen by the naked eye and that when viewed tl
powerful instruments. Even the telescope of Galil
vealed the rugged and desolate aspect of the surfac
lofty mountains, extensive depressions, and extinct volc
Maps of the telescopic appearance of the lunar disk
first executed by Christopher Sheiner, a contemporary
ileo. Numerous charts of different portions of the
were subsequently constructed by Langrenus, from h
observations at Madrid and Brussels. This astronomer
first to designate particular mountains and spots
moon's surface by the names of distinguished mathema
and astronomers. Charts of the moon have also bee
structed by Hevelius, Cassini, Schroeter, and others.
latest and most accurate is the result of the joint lal
Mädler of Dorpat, and Beer of Berlin. These astro
have executed a map of the moon's surface, of thirty
inches in diameter; which is said to surpass in accura
existing representation of either hemisphere of the ear

The darker portions of the lunar disk, so easily
guished by the naked eye, seem to be extensive depr
which, in consequence of some peculiarity of their co
tion, reflect but imperfectly the solar rays. Besides
the disk exhibits not only high mountains, but also
number of deep, circular pits, generally regarded as t
ters of extinct volcanoes. The height of Dorfel, the
of the lunar mountains, is, according to Beer and M
23,174 feet, or nearly 4½ miles. Newton and several
are nearly equal in altitude. A striking dissimilar

* Grant's Hist. of Phys. Astr., p. 121.

een terrestrial and lunar mountains was pointed out by late Professor Nichol, of Glasgow. The principal moun- ranges of our globe correspond in their direction with t circles on the surface; the moon, on the contrary, ex- its no traces whatever of such a coincidence. Now, cracks issures in the surface of a globe, produced in any way the action of a central force, would probably be found, obvious dynamical reasons, along the areas of great cir- . It has consequently been inferred that the mountains our satellite were not produced by the action of such a ral force. There can be no doubt, however, that they e in some way resulted from the gradual cooling of a ten mass.

The most remarkable crater on the moon's disk is that ed Tycho, in the southeast quadrant. Its height above level of the surrounding surface is nearly two and a half s, and above that of the enclosed level over three miles. diameter of the crater is about fifty miles. This won- ul object is thus graphically described by the late Dr. ol: "The country around it is peculiarly disturbed; e is no plain there larger than a common field. Now if, ing across that rugged district, one were gradually ap- ching Tycho, its first and distant aspect would seem like mmense wall or ridge of rock in the horizon, with a ch of nearly *fifty miles*, and reflecting the sun's rays with liar lustre. On approaching the ridge its character ld change; we should then discern that it is part of an ense circle, but perhaps neither so lofty nor so steep a practical mountaineer of the earth need shrink from scent. Suppose the ascent accomplished, and that with strial ideas, one stood on the summit. Trusting to the ogy of every disturbed region of our own planet, we t have thought of the opposite side, while it was unseen, as a corresponding *slope*, or at least as a descent which, if ring in steepness, would correspond in extent; but the is now in presence of an appalling contrast! On the of a dizzy cliff, passing down by one unbroken leap for 00 feet, the traveller gazes below in terror and bewilder- t. At the base of the cliff several low parallel terraces p along; but a little onwards the depth of the chasm is sled, and it descends from the top of the ridge no less 17,000 feet, or 2,000 feet more than the summit of T BLANC rises above the level of the sea! It is quickly ived, too, that this huge barrier encloses a vast circular

area of the moon's surface—an area fifty-five miles in diameter; so that, if the spectator were at the chasm's centre, he would find around him on every side, at the distance of twenty-seven miles, a gigantic and unbroken wall—unbroken by gap, or ravine, or pass of any description—rising into the air 17,000 feet, and forbidding his return to the external world! From the point at which I write, the solitary peak of Goatfell appears piercing into the clouds, although its elevation is less than 3,000 feet, and it is removed from me at least forty miles. How frightful, then, that seclusion in the moon—a chasm utterly impassable, its walls bare, rugged, hopeless as a prison's bars! It is a solitude, too, which nothing alleviates: verdure is never there, nor the song of bird; rain never refreshes, nor cloud shelters it; it is relieved from a scorching sun and flaming sky only by night with its stars. Nor among those countless pits is Tycho the most appalling. There are some of nearly equal depth whose diameter may not exceed 3,000 feet; nay, towards the polar regions of the moon, caverns probably exist whose depths have never yet been illumined by one beam of the solar light." *

This crater is the centre of a remarkable system of rays or luminous streaks, which, originating near its verge, extend in every direction to the distance of several hundred miles. They reflect light better than other parts of the surface, having an almost silvery brightness. No satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon has yet been given. Sir William Herschel suggested the idea of lava streams; but as careful examinations have shown that they pass alike over hills and valleys, and sometimes even over other craters, this hypothesis is now considered untenable. Dr. Nichol supposes the crater to have been formed by a sudden, tremendous explosion, which cracked the moon's crust in every direction, and that the molten matter from beneath rose through these fissures to the surface, where, cooling rapidly, it produced the phenomenon under consideration. Mädler and other astronomers have also indulged in conjectures on the subject, but every explanation hitherto proposed seems encumbered with difficulties. Copernicus, Kepler, Anaxagoras, Euler, Aristarchus, and a few other craters are the centres of similar systems of "luminous stripes." The crater of Coper-

* The Planetary System; its Order and Physical Structure, p. 292.

nicus is fifty-six miles in diameter; that of Kepler twenty-two; the depth of each being about two miles.

The "ring mountains" which we have described, though on some accounts the most remarkable, are by no means the most extensive. Mädler has measured several whose diameters are more than double that of Tycho. The greater part of the moon's visible surface is covered with these circular pits, varying in diameter from 149 miles down to a few hundred feet, or the smallest space visible to our best telescopes.

These striking characteristics of the moon's surface suggest the inquiry whether our own planet, notwithstanding the abrading and obliterating effects of air and water, still exhibits any remains of ancient craters analagous to those of our satellite. Of the *active* terrestrial volcanoes, Kilanea, in Hawaii, presents, in its distinctive features, the most striking resemblance to the ring mountains of the moon.* It has an immense crater, the diameter of which is over three miles, and the depth about 1,500 feet. The bottom is a plain of land, the greater part of which has solidified; in some places, however, it is entirely fluid, and in a state of active ebullition. "In approaching the crater, it is necessary to descend two steep terraces, each from 100 to 200 feet high, and extending entirely around the volcano. The outer one is 20, and the inner one 15 miles in circumference; and they obviously form the margin of vast craters formerly existing."† "The volcanic peak of Teneriffe stands in the center of a plain, covering 108 square miles, which is surrounded by perpendicular precipices and mountains, which were probably the border of the ancient crater."‡ Barren Island, in the Bay of Bengal, and the island of Santorini in the Grecian Archipelago, are regarded by geologists as the remains of immense volcanic craters. In regard to the origin of the peculiar configuration of coral islands, Sir Charles Lyell remarks: "The circular or oval forms of the numerous coral isles of the Pacific, with the lagoons in their centre, naturally suggest the idea that they are nothing more than the crests of submarine volcanoes, having the rims and bottoms of their craters overgrown by coral. This opinion is strengthened by the conical form of the submarine mountain, and the steep angle at which it plunges on all sides into the sur-

* See an interesting paper "On the Volcanoes of the Moon;" by Prof. Dana, in Silliman's Journal for November, 1846.
† Hitchcock's Geology, p. 295.
‡ Ib., p. 303.

rounding ocean. It is also well known that the Pacific great theatre of volcanic action, and every island, yet exami in the wide region termed Eastern Oceanica, consists en of volcanic rocks or coral limestones."* Adopting this v some astronomers suppose the present appearance of lunar surface to be a picture of what our own globe wa a very remote epoch, before the primitive features of its face were obliterated by sedimentary deposits.

The changes which the moon has produced and is producing on the earth's surface, through the agency of tides, is an interesting subject for investigation. It is however, which lies properly within the domain of the ologist.

The moon's mass, or quantity of matter, has been de mined by several independent methods. Her distu ing influence produces a sensible change in the sun's lo tude. In other words, the moon does not revolve round centre of the earth; the two bodies revolve round their c mon centre of gravity. The consequent deviation of earth's orbit from the regular elliptical form, produces a responding displacement of the sun; since the *apparen* sition of the latter in the ecliptic depends on the *true* pla the earth in its orbit. The mass of the moon has thus determined from its effect in changing the sun's appa place. Newton, Laplace, and others, estimated the q tity of matter in the moon from its influence in ra the tides of the ocean. Baron Lindenau, from hi searches on mutation, found the mass equal to one-eig seventh that of the earth; and still more recently, Peter Schidloffsky have found the ratio of the masses as on eighty-one. The corresponding density is nearly two-th of the mean density of the earth.

For the first few evenings after the appearance of the moon, the unenlightened portion of the disk is distinctly ible. This *lumière cendrée*, as it is termed by the Frenc not produced by any native light of the moon herself. admits, however, of an easy and obvious explanation. W the moon is between the sun and the earth, her dark he phere is in the direction of the latter. But, at the same t the whole illuminated surface of the earth is turned tow our satellite; and, as the moonlight increases to us, the ea light decreases, as seen from the moon, and *vice versa*. T

* Prin. of Geol., First Am. Ed., Vol. II., p. 176.

e surface of the earth being thirteen times greater than
t of the moon, the dark portion of the lunar disk receives
efficiency of earth-light to render it visible by a second-
r reflection.

There is an interesting feature of this ashy light, which,
far as known to the writer, has not been referred to by
r astronomer. Let any one, in a favorable state of the
osphere, observe the moon when from two to five days
. A narrow arc of light, much brighter than the rest of
lumière cendrée, will be noticed, clearly defining the cir-
, and connecting the cusps. The cause of this striking
erence will best appear by closely examining a good map
he full moon. The line of separation between the darker
brighter portions of the hemisphere will be observed, at
tle distance from the edge of the disk and nearly paral-
e it, around a large part of the circumference. A narrow
of the margin thus forms a part of the bright division of
surface; or, in other words, it is a better reflector than
so-called seas, immediately interior.

The moon's rotation on her axis is completed in a period
osely equal to that of her orbital revolution, and obser-
ion renders it highly probable that the same is true of all
er satellites. Sir Isaac Newton's explanation* of this fact
mes that the moon was once in a fluid state. Indeed,
primitive fluidity of all the bodies in the solar system
ms to be indicated by a variety of circumstances. It is
l known that Mercury, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, and Sa-
n are not perfectly spherical, but flattened at the poles
raised at the equator; that is, they have the form taken
a fluid globe when compelled to revolve about an axis.
e attraction of the earth on the moon's originally molten
s would cause it to assume a spheroidal form, and always
ntain the greatest axis in the direction of the primary.
If we suppose, in accordance with the nebular hypo-
is, that our satellite once existed in a gaseous form, not
r must its diameter have exceeded the present diameter of
earth, but its tidal elevation must have been vastly
ter than during the epoch of fluidity. The observed co-
idence may thus have taken its origin, while the moon
yet in a state of vapor.

Whether the moon has or has not an atmosphere, is a
estion which has engaged the attention of astronomers,

* Principia, B. III. Prop. XXXVII.

ever since the invention of the telescope. As our satellite occasionally eclipses the stars which lie along her path, it is obvious that her atmosphere, if she has any, must refract the light of such stars in passing through it. Sir David Brewster * refers to some old observations which seemed to indicate a sensible refraction. They have not been confirmed, however, by more recent and powerful instruments. The celebrated Schroeter claimed to have discovered a lunar twilight, and even to have found by measurement the greatest height at which the lunar atmosphere has sufficient density to affect the light of the stars. This he fixed at 6,749 feet, or about a mile and a quarter. On the other hand, the observations of Sir William Herschel, in 1793, indicated the entire absence of any sensible atmosphere. "If a lunar atmosphere exists," says Mr. Hind, "it must be one of excessive rarity and of no great extent, otherwise it would give rise to phenomena which could not fail to attract the attention of the observer. Astronomers have long held a divided opinion on this subject, and it is still a *questio vexata*. The latest selenographer, Professor Mädler, is of opinion that there may be a thin atmospheric envelope of variable extent." †

While, then, we cannot affirm with certainty that the moon's visible hemisphere is wholly destitute of air, we are justified in the statement, that if any exists, its density cannot exceed that of the atmosphere in what is termed the exhausted receiver of an air-pump.

The recent researches of M. Hansen, a distinguished mathematician, have indicated the cause of this absence of an atmosphere from the side next the earth, as well as the probable existence of such an envelope on the remote hemisphere. The moon's centre of form, according to this astronomer, is not coincident with its centre of gravity. The former is several miles less distant, and is situated in the straight line joining the latter and the centre of the earth. In other words, the lunar hemisphere turned earthwards is probably not less than sixteen miles *higher*—that is, more distant from the centre of gravity than the one opposite. Now as any fluid naturally seeks the lowest level, it is obvious that an atmosphere of moderate extent would all collect on the lunar hemisphere nearest the centre of gravity; that is on the side invisible from the earth. While, therefore, at

* More Worlds than One, p. 112. † Solar System, p. 54.

least one half of the moon's surface is uninhabitable for want of an atmosphere, a large portion of the remainder may possibly be adapted to the existence of sentient beings.

The light of the full moon, according to the generally received estimate, is to that of the sun in the ratio of 1 to 300,000.* Reasoning from analogy, we might therefore conclude that the heating power must be extremely feeble. Such, in fact, is found to be the case. De la Hire, by means of a large burning-glass, concentrated the rays of the full moon to a focus, in which he placed the bulb of a delicate thermometer. He was unable, however, to detect the slightest increase of temperature. Others have made similar attempts with no better success. The credit of first proving beyond doubt that the moonlight is sensibly calorific, is due to M. Melloni. Using a lens over three feet in diameter, he concentrated the lunar rays upon his thermoscopic pile: the effect was a sensible deviation of the needle, the amount of deflection varying with the age and altitude of the moon. This discovery of the heating power of our satellite is characterized by Humboldt as one of "the most important and surprising of our century."

The most obvious effect of our satellite's influence on the earth is seen in the periodical fluctuations of the ocean. A mysterious connection between the moon and the tides was suspected by Pytheas, Pliny, and other writers of antiquity. The celebrated Kepler published a treatise on the subject, in which he distinctly ascribed the phenomena to the attraction of the sun and moon. The first explanation of the subject, however, is due to Sir Isaac Newton.

The various results of these unceasing fluctuations would be difficult to estimate. "By such wondrous hydro-dynamic laws," says an eminent writer, "the waters of the ocean are prevented from becoming stagnant; and the currents thus created temper the frigid waters of the arctic circle with the tepid floods of the torrid zone, and mingle the corrected coolness of the former with the overheated billows of the latter. Here, then, is the grand cleanser of harbors and transporter of laden carracks, the mighty means of health and wealth among the civilized, and the bearer of many benefits even to the savage."

Were the tides produced solely by the moon's attraction

* This is the estimate of Bouguer. See his *Traité d'Optique sur la Gradation de la Lumière*, published at Paris in 1760.

—were they entirely undisturbed by winds, islands, continents, &c., and were the moon always at precisely the same distance from the earth, the height of the tidal wave would be exactly the same every day of the year. None of these conditions, however, obtain. In the first place, the winds are a source of endless variation. It is impossible, therefore, to predict the precise height of any future tides, simply because we cannot foreknow either the direction or force of the winds which may affect them. It is also obvious that their course and altitude must be modified by the nature of the coasts which they encounter in their progress. Again, the orbit of the moon is not a circle, but an ellipse, having the earth in one of its foci; her distance, therefore, is not always the same. Now, as the height of the tide depends upon the force of the moon's attraction, and since attraction decreases as the square of the distance increases, it follows that the tides will be greatest when the moon is in perigee, and least when in apogee. But there are also solar as well as lunar tides; owing, however, to the great distance of the sun, the height of the former is much less than that of the latter. They are more or less distinctly marked, according as they concur or conflict with those produced by the moon. Their concurrence, *i. e.*, when the sun, earth, and moon are nearly in the same straight line, produces the highest, or spring tides; while their opposition, or conflict, marks the lowest, or neap tides.

There is still another source of variation: the earth's orbit is also elliptical; and hence the greatest solar tide will occur when the earth is in that part of her orbit nearest the sun. The greatest possible tide, then, is that which is produced when the sun and moon are in conjunction, and both, at the same time, at their least distance from the earth. This somewhat rare coincidence took place about the last of December, 1849.

Of the numerous influences popularly ascribed to the moon, we may specify the following:

1. Its supposed effect upon the human system. The belief that certain maladies, both bodily and mental, vary in intensity with the changes of the moon, was very ancient, and is not, perhaps, altogether without advocates even at the present. It is sufficient to remark, however, that the opinion has never been substantiated by accredited facts.

2. It is believed by many that our satellite exerts an important influence on vegetation, and that plants, trees, &c.,

in order to flourish, must be planted or grafted during the increase of the moon. A great number of experiments have been made in France by scientific men, for the express purpose of testing this question. The result has shown that the common opinion is wholly unfounded.

3. But the most generally received doctrine in regard to the moon's influence is that its changes have some causal connection with changes in the weather. This question, perhaps, cannot yet be decided. It is said, however, that the popular belief is not substantiated by any extensive series of recorded observations.

ART. III. *Memorials and Letters Illustrative of the Life and Times of John Grahame of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee.* By MARK NAPIER. Edinburgh. 3 vols., 1859, 1863.

THE three sturdy octavos which Mr. Napier has presented to the world and to posterity, certainly contain few points for praise in a literary point of view. As a store-house of facts and data, they possess some value; as a monument of unwearied toil, they are honorable; but as a work for general reading, they are hopelessly unsatisfactory. Not only are they unconscionably long and preposterously incommensurate with the interest which the public can be supposed to feel in their subject, but they have the further aggravating mischief of poor execution. There is no method in them; not even so much as chronological arrangement.

Mr. Napier's mental digestion was quite unable to cope with the mighty feast which his research spread before him. A multitude of allusions to the classic authors of ancient and modern times are scattered broadcast through the work, and the frequent use of quaint, antique and unusual words and phrases vindicate his claim to scholarship and to extensive reading. But this richness in literary innuendo, which in moderation is apt to please, is so excessive in these volumes as to appear tawdry. Moreover, we are made incessantly and painfully aware by a certain virulence in the general tone of the work, by a species of fierceness in statement and animosity of speech, that we are reading the passionate argument of a partisan. The violent temper of an angry advocate jars continually upon the feelings of the readers;

passionate exclamations, language too strong to be properly used, except in eager personal controversies, are constantly breaking the even and dignified tenor of an historical work, exciting sometimes disgust, sometimes ridicule, but always appearing reprehensible, and by no means conducing to persuasion or belief. If Mr. Napier wishes to make proselytes he might study with advantage the fable of the traveller who drew his cloak the tighter, the more keenly the wind attacked him, but yielded it readily before the gentle rays of the sun.

Listen to the merciless vigor of his plan as set forth by himself in his introduction (p. xix). The first division of his work, he explains, "is intended to clear the way by the removal of that superincumbent load of mistaken history and vulgar error which has really placed Grahame of Claverhouse in the category of historical myths. Public opinion on the subject required a regular siege, and we have laid our approaches accordingly. In this review we have bestowed upon previous historians a measure of respect as regards the subject of 'Bloody Claver'se' in proportion to the justice which they have bestowed upon him." What was Mr. Napier's opinion of the quantity and quality of this justice, which he so liberally promises to requite, no reader of his volumes can well doubt. He further informs us that his undertaking was "greatly provoked by the domineering anathemas of Lord Macaulay against the champion of James II." And his first chapter is entitled "Preliminary Review of False History and Vulgar Errors Relating to Dundee."

This is the language of an electioneering pamphlet. Yet this fault of temper is an error shared in common by all men who have ever been seduced into this Claverhouse controversy from the days of Wodrow down to those of Aytoun. A bacchantic fury seems to have possessed the contestants on either side; and they fling scholarly abuse at each other, and hew with the swords of scurrilous phrases, and cast the lances of savage contradictions like so many frantic mænades. It is, therefore, with some diffidence that we undertake to handle this miraculous subject, even in a brief article; and we fear the mystic wrath may kindle our soul into disputatious rage; just as the savage who has seen a party of pale-faces becoming crazy or maudlin over a few queer-looking jugs, at first meddles with the same with a very gingerly and anticipatory touch, but finally becomes an even wilder disciple of the fire-water than his own exemplars. Nevertheless, we shall venture upon our task, trusting that a spirit

conscious of no partiality may succeed in sustaining its equipoise. The authorities are numerous enough, if they were only harmonious, to settle the most vexed question of morals, history or science; but since the poles are not wider apart than their opposing statements, the cloud of witnesses, by its very density, seems to shut out the sunlight of truth, and to darken our vision.

Wodrow, the petty vender of slanderous wares, and Lord Macaulay, the lofty and imperious historiarch, have, in their widely different ways, painted him black as a son of Belial. Sir Walter Scott, with a tolerably dispassionate pen, has given us only the dubious and misty outline of a romancer's picture. Mr. Napier says, with disgust, that the eminent novelist, with temporising timidity, has made a plum-pudding of virtues and of vices, and has depicted a nondescript animal, a sort of mermaid, or centaur; though we are loath to pass so harsh a judgment on the author of Old Mortality. Mr. John H. Burton, "a fluent historian, from whose acuteness and industry more might have been expected," pleases no better, and concludes his budget of errors "oddly enough, but like all the rest, with historical blunders." Poor Claverhouse! Such resolute, unrelenting calumny is hard indeed! But if this side of the shield is very black, the other is of lucent brilliancy. Napier and Aytoun, men who in the tranquillity of to-day study the relics of a past century, sentimentally bewail the Stuarts and talk harmless Jacobinism, certainly dipped their pens in ink of the rainbow, and have verily drawn an archangel, another Gabriel, crushing a second fiend called Calvinism. In this Babel it is our function to assume the serene functions of judge; to weigh the eloquence and hostility of opposing advocates; to value the testimony of dead witnesses; to deplore the loss of yellow letters that have long since mouldered in indiscriminating waste-baskets; and finally to judge the prisoner at the bar, over whose dust and ashes the oblivion of nearly two centuries has rolled. It is a tangled skein of black and white and dingy threads, out of which to braid the golden twine of truth.

John Grahame of Claverhouse was born in Scotland in 1643. He was of gentle blood and high connections; yet, though an eldest son, he was heir to no titles, and only to a meagre patrimony. No tales prophetic of future greatness garniah the history of his early years. No sturdy crone patted the head of the manly warrior, and told pretty tales of his boyhood, showing how the germ of the distinguished

oak was discovered by her in the infantile acorn. Even the question of his graduation at St. Andrews, in 1665, has been mooted fiercely, but without decisive results—an unimportant matter perhaps, but destined, by the fatality of acrimoniousness which clings to this strange mortal, to be dragged into the arena of controversy. It may be interesting to know that Napier avers that his name may be read on the matriculation-books of St. Leonard's College, even by those who "*golf*." Sir Walter Scott casually accuses him of "spelling like a chambermaid," and Mr. Napier again falls into a terrible rage thereat, because, in that age, it was a very creditable thing to spell at all, or, indeed, that it was then even considered unfashionable and low-bred to be over nice in spelling in one's correspondence. The hero himself, probably, thought the matter of education to be of very slight moment, when he began to look around for occupation in the world, and doubtless found a trenchant sword a vastly better dependence than an accurate pen. In those days, the camp and the court were the sole avenues through which a young man of respectability could enter into active life. Claverhouse did not hesitate long in making his choice; in the language of Pistol, he said within himself that the world was an oyster which he must open with his sword. He first sought service under the banner of the French King. But at the end of a year or two he was with the Stadtholder, William of Orange. And in the heat of the battle of Seneffe, he had the seeming good fortune to pluck this prince out of a filthy Dutch bog, whose too adhesive embrace, had it not been for this timely rescue, must have held its valuable prize until death or captivity overtook him. The reward for this gallant action was meted out with the customary liberality from that treasury of royal promises which never runs low; but the practical mind of Claverhouse did not appreciate intangible largesses and unnegotiable drafts on royal favor. So he threw up his commission in disgust, and turned his back on the Low Countries, shaking the dust from his angry feet. Mr. Napier is very inhumanely provoked that the poor Dutchman, who lived to become William III. of England, had not been left to perish in his native mud; in which case there might have been no Revolution of 1688, Claverhouse might have ended a life of glory by the tranquil death of old age, and Great Britain might now enjoy the inestimable pleasure of a Stuart sovereign. His regret sounds almost absurd in its partisan pathos. "This brave action,"

he says, "was performed in an evil hour for himself and his native monarchs. Had it not been for his luckless aid, the persecutor of his family, the evil genius of the unfortunate James, the fiend of Glencoe might have sunk, innocuous and comparatively unknown, in the depths of a Batavian marsh." Modern England will hardly cry amen to this Jacobite tirade.

Claverhouse, on his return to Scotland, soon began to look around for something to do. He was not of sufficient note as yet to be sought out in his obscurity, or to depend, like a second Elijah, upon the kindness of ravens flying from the court to seek him. But he had useful connections, and was, withal, quite a promising young fellow, with an enterprising spirit, a cavalier presence, and a face of remarkable and aristocratic beauty. He was accordingly soon surprised and pleased by a letter from his cousin, the Marquis of Montrose, couched in the most flattering terms, offering him a lieutenancy in the regiment of cavalry which that nobleman was then raising in Scotland, under the auspices of the Duke of York (afterwards James II.). Here was reputation, and an unexceptionably excellent opening. The position was honorable, and the officers were all men of rank and family—indeed all, except Claverhouse, seem to have been titled. But scarcely had he accepted this with grateful pleasure, when he received yet another and more distinguished gift from the hand of Fortune, who seemed, for the time, resolved quite to smother her young suitor with a shower of favors. Montrose was promoted, and Claverhouse had not been many months a lieutenant before he was commissioned as colonel of the regiment, with lords of the realm for his subalterns. It was a proud elevation, yet with it we scent the smoke of contest, and the following decade of his life is the subject of the vituperations of Wodrow and Macaulay, the laudation of Napier and Aytoun.

An introductory sketch of the spirit of the times in Scotland, is necessary to a fair view of the subject. In no other country throughout Europe did the Reformation glow with an equal ardor. The furnace hissed at a white heat, for the fuel was of the hottest. Nearly every trait of the Scottish disposition required but little exaggeration to become transformed into the characteristic of the fanatic; and every element of the complete fanatic was to be found in the typical Scotchman. The two spirits mingled like naphtha and petroleum or Greek fire, and produced an unnatural and unquenchable

blaze. A nation certainly is in the most desperate and m
ful stress when its very virtues turn against it and c
themselves in the relentless terrors of obstinate foes.
it befel in Scotland. That education which taught
man to read his Bible, but gave him no knowledge to
prehend it withal; that sincere and serious searching
truth that led all to argue and speculate, yet with cra
and narrow resources; that honesty which knew no
promise, so fatal in its mistaken strength; that body,
ened for the endurance of pain, and sustained by the i
ible spirit of the courageous martyr which defied e
the assaults of caresses or of force;—all these now tur
the exceeding prejudice of the people, whose pride and
such traits ought to have been, and, in better times
never failed to be. The "honest Scot," the "kindly
the "hardy Scot," became possessed of a relentless
Like the bull in his madness, his contracted vision co
hended only one object, supposed to be a mortal foe, di
in front. There is a vigor of faith in the Scottish mi
rigid as their mountain-braced sinews, which believes
a thoroughness and tenacity of conviction, inflexible by
ment, unmalleable by violence, invincible by corrupti
logic-chopping people, acute so far as their intell
tether will permit them to range, their very inquisiti
and imperfect knowledge render them peculiarly lia
adopt an erroneous view, and to cling to it irremovably.
tish manliness, independence and resolution are excellen
ities when they enter into the composition of a well-o
mind; and the native sobriety and seriousness give a w
served national reputation for worth. But when thes
jects of the mind rebel against subjection, repudiate th
of common sense, raze the bounds of moderation, coml
stiff-necked mutiny against law, order, established c
and reasonable restrictions, then it must be granted th
Indian Brahmin, when drunk with "bang," or swing
a huge beef-hook thrust beneath his back-bone, is not
unreasonable or impracticable being than the Scot. T
melancholy pass was the nation brought by that gra
ropean tumult, which ought to have proved only a
purification of a magnificent edifice, wherein ignc
carelessness, vice, and irreverence had allowed too
masses of corruption to accumulate. Under the stim
the times, every peasant soon became a polemic, and,
line, thought himself peculiarly gifted. Dogmas, argu

and theories of religion became his daily food; they really seemed to become meat and drink and clothing to him, for he readily neglected all his past laborious means of support, and addicted himself solely to these spiritual matters. Every heath had its pulpit, and every pulpit a host of incumbents; yet every incumbent seemed still to find a multitude of hearers. The fuel, instead of consuming, only glowed with ever-increasing fierceness; and the breath of innumerable and unweariable preachers perpetually blew the flames to an intenser heat. Thus at last it came about that a people, who have perhaps more of what may be strictly called national virtues than any other nation on the earth, made of their fatherland a perfect Bedlam, wherein, however, the frenzy of every patient took the same painful and violent form.

The government found itself in a very awkward and trying position, as every liberal and conscientious government must, when called upon to deal with religious innovations which begin to assume the features and proportions of party. At that day every nation had its creed; and this professed and formal theorem of belief was as much a branch and limb of the entirety of government as was the army or the navy or the foreign bureau. That system of complete freedom, which is to-day brought to such absolute perfection, was then unknown and undreamed of in the theories of politics; we may almost say that it was still as "uninvented" as the telegraph. At the same time, persecution, as a corrective, was most odious to the spirit of the people, and was most reluctantly and timidly stretched, by the rulers, to any degree bordering upon severity. The Inquisition, its racks, its dungeons, its executions and burnings were machinery which it was out of the question to think of using in Great Britain. So the king and his advisers found religious disaffection, at first, a slippery and impalpable foe to deal with. For a time they could do little, and undertook to do little, save by most innocuous legislation, which proved invariably so many words spoken to the winds, if not even worse. Perhaps this course was the best; for whatever may be any man's personal religious sympathies, yet everybody to-day, and a vast proportion in those days themselves, would have cried out in horror at any serious symptoms of torturing and burning simply for religion's sake, however reprehensible the conduct of the malcontents might have been.

The result showed the wisdom of the royal strategy; for the

headstrong Scots were not long in putting themselves quite in the wrong, and giving to their adversaries the moral force of external appearance and plausibility—the only thing which had for some time been wanting to them. This they did by linking politics to creeds, while, from religious malcontents, they hastened to assume the more tangible and practicable form of political malcontents; nor were they content until their dissatisfaction came to the pitch of actual rebellion. They broke audaciously every law; they assembled in armed and disorderly bands throughout the country; they mobbed those pastors and curates who submitted to the most moderate and reasonable decrees of Parliament, and they subjected these unfortunnate men to every personal indignity; neither did they abstain from bloodshed; and solitary emissaries of the established church and of government were not safe on the moors and hill sides. In numerous and armed conventicles they preached the holy regicide of a satanic monarch, the foe of God and of the children of light. On every church-door, on barns, and on village trees, they posted the most inflammatory placards, denouncing, with savage ire, king, government, and church, summoning to sedition, and proclaiming the sanctity of rebellion. They even opened secret communication with the low Countries which were then at open war with Great Britain. In short, they themselves challenged and defied the strong arm of secular authority, while neither their numbers, their knowledge, their cause, nor their wrongs reasonably justified revolution.

It is seldom that a righteous cause does not find wiser, greater, and better men to utter its arguments, array its partisans, and fight its battles, than the League of the Covenanters succeeded in evoking in Scotland; and the cause of a wrongly oppressed people, whatever may be its ultimate success, is usually conducted with greater internal harmony; with less clamor, and more persistent and organized resolution. Out of their own mouths, men, with the feelings of to-day, will incline to condemn them. Thus, finally, the short-sighted imprudence of the Covenanters put the game into the hands of the government, by driving it to that strait when it was obliged either to yield to the insane fury of secession, or to resort to some practical and vigorous means of enforcing order and the laws. An armed political rebellion, aiming at a severance of the kingdom, and at an independent existence, could be met only in one way, and to this way the administration now turned, perhaps not un-

illingly. No argument is necessary to justify their recourse
arms, and to severe punishments of the captured offenders.
igor was indispensable; even harshness might have found
ause or palliation.

Still they issued no bloody mandate; they sent no over-
elming force of licentious soldiery, under irresponsible
ders, to lay waste with fire and sword the offending coun-
, and to maltreat and slay the mutinous inhabitants. The
t efforts at suppression were conducted by Gen. Dalyell,
o, by his success at Pentland Hills, temporarily crushed
. dissaffection. And when, some time afterwards, the
Whigs" as they were called, again found courage to com-
t disturbances, the entire charge of military proceedings
s entrusted to Claverhouse. The essence of his duties lay
what might, perhaps, be termed guerilla warfare, if this
m may be used in an honest and honorable sense. With
all detachments of his troopers he scoured the country
l dispersed conventicles, and strove to overawe mutinous
rits by the presence and show of force. When he fell in
h any of the ringleaders, or of the more notorious among
disaffected, he sent them to be tried by the Civil Board
Edinburgh. It nowhere appears that he himself had any
ect authority to administer severe punishment; certainly
did not put to death any person, however obnoxious,
om he might capture in his forays. But that he occasion-
y sat in this judicial board, may be true—we seem
nd to believe it since Sir Walter Scott, who on Scottish
tory ought to be unimpeachable, represents him in that
ition; still, such occasions, even if they came within the
ular scope of his duties, must by the requirements of his
litary position have been few and far between. This tri-
nal took a few lives; but on the ground of open and
ed rebellion against the royal authority. A religious test
s sometimes applied, it is true, but not precisely with a
igious object; rather as a political touch-stone to discover,
a tolerably sure analogy, the secular heart of the person
question. Whoever was willing to drink to the king and
pray for him was not likely to be very roughly handled.
e torture of the steel-boot and of Lord Lauderdale's fa-
ite "thumbkins" was sometimes resorted to. This was
l enough, perhaps, though mild, according to the notions
the times. Mr. Napier's criticisms on the conduct of his
o at this period are full of laudation; clemency shone in
benignant aspect; long-suffering was in his heart; mod-
tion lurked in every accent of his tongue.

The best support of this eulogium must, inde
sought in the letters of the colonel himself, but his
tion for outspoken frankness was so universal, and he
little to fear from any acknowledgements of severit
he may perhaps be fairly received to testify in his o
half. We will give one or two extracts from this cor
dence. March 1, 1682, he writes: "The way tha
taken in other places is to put laws severely agains
and small in execution; which is very just; but wha
does that produce but to exasperate and alienate the
of the whole people? For it renders three desperate,
it gains one; and your lordship knows that in the g
crimes it is thought wisest to pardon the multitude a
ish the ringleaders, where the number of the guilty
as in this case of whole counties, wherefore I hav
another course here." &c., &c. Again he says he
make example of some great men for "it will be c
consequence to punish one considerable laird than o
dred little bodies. Besides it is juster; because the
sin by the example of those." Another time he boas
he has "reduced the rebels without blood, and brou
whole country to obedience and conformity to the
government, without severity and extortion; few
being fined and that gently; and under that, few is o
be fined, but two or three in a parish." June 9, 1
find: "I am as sorry to see a man die, even a whig,
of themselves. But when one dies justly for his own
and may save a hundred to fall in the like, I have n
ples." These are excellent sentiments, and if we we
certain that their author acted as wisely and as virtu
he wrote, we could hardly praise him too much.

That he was perfectly justified, when ordered up
service, in obeying his superiors, and in retaining h
mand with all the active duties annexed thereto, w
there can be no reasonable doubt. The only question
fore, which ought to be allowed to affect his reputa
whether he did any gratuitous evil; whether, in t
gance of power, or in the plenitude of the maliciou
a sanguinary heart, he was guilty of unnecessary
Such a course was certainly open to him, did his dis
lead him to enter upon it. The job which was g
him was one of those disagreeable but necessary task
a government imposes upon its subalterns for exe
and, provided only it be well and thoroughly done, fe

ward questions will be asked as to the means, and no fault found with the manner. He entered upon the business with *carte-blanche*, but calumny says the page was not so spotless at the close.

Wodrow is the chief defamer; from Lord Macaulay and others we only catch the echoes of his tones; "Fox," says the disgusted Napier, "swallowed him whole as readily as he would have swallowed an oyster." And who was Wodrow? His indignant opponent shall describe him eloquently.[a] "Of a narrow mind and a very low intellect, prone to the most senseless and illiterate superstitions, and somewhat deficient in the quality of conscientiousness, the fanatical author's bustling and laborious activity became indeed most availing for the apology and eloge of Scottish fanaticism; but it was by reason of the effrontery with which he proceeded to gloss iniquity and to confound truth—to malign the high-minded and to sanctify the murderer." We can hardly approve such keen language in a work pretending to the dignity of history; still the lash falls not undeservedly on the back of Wodrow. During his lifetime unknown alike to fortune and to fame, little information is to be gathered concerning him, save that which may be gleaned from his works. These were, "A History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution," and the "Analecta; or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences, Mostly Relating to Scotch Ministers and Christians." The latter, a work of two lumbering folios, is the most noted under the popular name of the "Martyrology," and is, further, the one bearing especially upon our present subject. Fortunately, it is not one of those artificial and finished results of scholarship, from which the grindstone of education has effaced all the irregularities of individuality; on the contrary, the book seems garrulous of its writer, and is eager to tell us, with multitudinous tongues, that he was ignorant by nature and uncultivated by art; that he was credulous, malicious, unscrupulous, and fanatical; in short, that he was as unreliable a man as can well be conceived. The "Martyrology" is an extraordinary hotch-potch of blood and superstition. Wodrow bustled to and fro through the kingdom, searching in every nook and corner for tales of horror to form into the frightful mosaic of his record; and a very shocking pavement he managed in the end to

[a] Vol. I, p. 59.

make of it. Whatever anybody would tell him he was ready to believe, provided the veracity of the relater were vouched for by the soundness of his religious views; and by comparing some of his original notes, still in existence, with the final result, we learn that in time he became such a connoisseur in these matters, took such a professional interest therein, that when a tale seemed to him wanting in any of the essential qualities of such merchandise of the first class, he hesitated not to repair the deficiency out of his own well-stocked repertory of terrors. But his contributors certainly did their best to save him trouble of this kind. They showed a generous emulation in furnishing the desired material; and among the covenanting peasantry of Scotland, it seemed quite as indispensable to family respectability to have a story in the "Martyrology," as it was in circles of rank to have a family ghost.

The advice of his friend, George Redpath, himself no unskilled dabbler in this horror-mongering trade, furnishes an interesting hint as to the method of getting up such collections in masterly and satisfactory style. He writes to Wodrow, "humbly proposing that what is merely circumstantial might be left out, except where it is necessary for illustrating the matter, or aggravating the crimes of our enemies." Intermingled with narratives of the diabolical acts of Claverhouse, we find entertaining snatches of the supernatural and amusing peeps into the spiritual world. No heathen ever cherished more liberal notions of multitudinous hosts of unearthly visitants than did this petty chronicler. To his mind, miracles were quite in the order of nature. He tells us that wine at the lips of the "oppressors" turned into clotted gore; that their demoniac feet made water boil; that their bodies cast no shadow; of course, also, they were lead-proof. Tell-tale corpses sat up in their shrouds to point their fingers at the miserable murderers; and one woman speaking from her coffin, with the voice of the dead, told her terror-stricken mourners that, for the sins of slandering, back-biting and false witness, her miserable soul then knew the fire and torments of hell. We can imagine the sensitive quiver of alarm which the mention of such recompense for these sins must have sent through the tattling "auld wives," the coadjutors of Wodrow, if not through that honest worthy himself. A servant-maid likewise saw the "meekle black deevil" in close conference with Archbishop Sharpe, at the right reverend elbow, in his private closet.

l these tales, and many more of a similar tenor,
ı Napier dubs "Wodrowana," are transplanted lib-
into his volumes, accompanied with various energetic
ciations of holy horror, numberless exclamation marks,
ıe suggestive running commentary of judicious italics.
these we learn the mind and temper of the man upon
ı writings alone the defamers of Claverhouse have
ed their belief. Still it must be confessed that, beyond
undermining of hostile evidence the resources of
Jacobite writers are very meagre. Occasionally
ndless research of an undaunted antiquarian, whom
and time might in vain attempt to baffle, will prove
repancy of date or place, or will discover some fragment
official record disclosing an alien responsibility; and
Claverhouse is acquitted. Again, rumors and uncon-
l traces will be brought to light, sometimes partially
orating the narrative of the "Martyrology," yet always
cient to surely fix either guilt or innocence. By far the
ır portion, however, of Wodrow's stories depend solely
ı individual authority, and not the slightest vestige of
is elsewhere discoverable. This authority, we are satis-
s of the lowest grade, and ought hardly to suffice to con-
a dog; though, in support of the belief that somewhere
ı mass must lurk some elements of truth, we ought not
glect the presumptions fairly arising from the universal
ation in which Claverhouse has always been held among
cottish peasantry, nor that popular and most odious
me of the "Bloody Claver'se" which has ever clung to
Such wide-spread and traditional belief can hardly be
ed to pass for nothing.

is hard to answer the convenanting arguments, for the
rials for defence are even more scanty than those at hand
osecution. The unfortunate accused, or rather his *memory*,
s into court quite empty handed, with neither witnesses
documents at command. This fact ordinarily would
itself suspicious if not condemnatory; but it is here
explained. Col. Grahame, in the vision of Wodrow
is brethren of the convenanting quill, filled the entire
on. To the friends of government he appeared sim-
s a very good colonel of dragoons. Naturally enough,
nals of memoirists have preserved the history of a
who appeared of not much larger calibre or greater
ation than crowds of other successful men. The cavil-
and vituperations of such as Wodrow, were not known

at all, or werek nown only to be despised, in the days of their birth. At the present day, if a judge were to be reviled with scurrilous invective by sundry persons whom he had committed to the penitentiary as common drunkards or vagabonds, assuredly nobody would hunt up the material for a labored defence—and similar, whether rightly or not cannot now be decided, was the position occupied by Claverhouse. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that this hostile compilation, far from being contemporary, did not see the light until thirty-three years after the death of Grahame; and even then, they who might have inclined to take up the pen in his defence, very probably did not know of the obscure publication which has only lately been brought into notice; or knowing it, they may have disdained it, as the puny attack of one of those ephemeral insects who cannot themselves survive their own stinging, and die in the very infliction of the wound upon another. Further, Claverhouse's duties were not of a kind to find any place on public records, save in rare and isolated cases; neither was it an age of newspapers and pamphlets nor of general literary tastes which might have moved gallant colonels to keep diaries. All parole evidence had of course mouldered far out of reach, before the present controversy made it an object of interest to restore the dilapidated picture of one who could never owe such notoriety to his intrinsic greatness.

We undertake, therefore, neither absolutely to acquit nor positively to condemn. We are content to have stated the case; we have shown the low value of the evidence against Claverhouse; but we have also admitted the presumption arising from the amount and popularity of that evidence; further we have duly accounted for the want of evidence in exculpation; we have given extracts of his correspondence, to be taken for what they may be worth as proof of his disposition. But we help nobody to a conclusion; on the contrary, we aim to show the absolute impossibility of a decision certainly correct. It is, however, something gained, to lay bare the feeble foundations upon which each party has reared its respective superstructure of extravagant and positive dogmas. The controversialists of neither side will thank us, of course—while the hot blood of conflict still rushes through their veins—but the impartial public at large may not be inattentive to our verdict. As an expression of a slight individual bias, in concluding, we may, perhaps, properly say, that to us it appears that there is some preponder-

ance in favor of Grahame; and this impression has grown gradually and surely upon us during the slow and deliberate pursuit of a pretty thorough investigation; still so totally unable are we to support this sufficiently as a conviction, that we do not venture to present it to any one as a judgment demanding belief.

Grahame's career during these "troubles" afforded only two opportunities for the display of much strategic talent. The first of these was at Drumclog, where an overwhelming force of Covenanters surprised and routed a detachment of the regiment with Claverhouse at its head, which, however, only numbered 150 or 200 men. This was a disaster, but under the circumstances no disgrace; and it was afterwards more than atoned for by the great and decisive victory at Bothwell Brigg. This latter affair was more than a skirmish; from the number of the combatants, and the value attached to the result, it deserves fairly the name of a battle. The superiority of organization and discipline of the royal troops was, or ought to have been, more than compensated by the much larger numbers of the rebels. At some points the conflict was sharp, though a panic fell upon the chief part of the religionist army as they beheld the excellent disposition and resolute front presented by the approaching foe; and a wretched division in council, with wrangling among the leaders, who drew their notions of military science from the conflicts recorded in Holy Writ, completed the paralysis of their courage. Claverhouse won a complete and brilliant victory, which for a time thoroughly quelled the warlike spirit of the vanquished. This was his only encounter on a large scale, but in his petty expeditions he displayed such qualities of daring, resolution, and enterprise, that abilities for greater things were generally attributed to him, and he won the reputation of being an able commander, whom adequate occasions might be expected to develop into a great general.

It was in the midst of this agitation, which endured some eight years or more, that the Grahame's "fancy lightly turned to thoughts of love." The handsome and *bien vu* young colonel, of ancient family and excellent prospects, who had already a national reputation, might have met with a kinder reception than young Lochinvar in the baronial halls of the North; and might easily have made a prey of some heiress of broad Scottish acres. What, then, is our surprise to find him at the hearthstone of a malignant, whispering tender

words into the stiffly-starched "cockernony" of the prim, dissenting daughter of the house. It may be because the father had not learned from the then unpublished chronicles of Wodrow, what a diabolical suitor was making this foray into his virtuous household; or it may be that in troublous times he thought it fair policy to have a friend among the oppressors; but, at any rate, the alliance met with no opposition, and the strange knot was tied. A chief "persecutor" was joined in wedlock to one of the "persecuted." Yet, odd as was the marriage, the honeymoon was still odder. For the happy couple had not fairly counted out twenty-four hours of marital bliss, when, as the tale runneth, they were interrupted by the snort of the inevitable war-horse at the door, and the notes of the seldom silent bugle. So the bridegroom mounted, and rode over moss and heather, to pounce like a hawk upon some covey of "puir whig bodies;" while the bride at home was, perchance, praying lustily for their escape. But on this matter of harmony history deponeth not. And though Mr. Wodrow waxes vastly fierce, in a general way, at the wicked impropriety of the match, and intimates vaguely that the husband was not overkind to the wife, yet this scandal is unsupported, and we may fairly believe that the match proved happy.

Domestic ease, however, was not the lot of Claverhouse, who had certainly been born with other fates than to sit cosily in the warm ingle-nook. He enjoyed very scant breathing space after the covenanting troubles were laid well at rest, before the black clouds which finally burst in the revolutionary tempest of 1668 lowered ominous in the horizon, and rolling up, muttering, settled low over the land. The remainder of his career must be viewed with mingled sentiments of admiration and regret. It is the chequered picture, brilliant at once and sad, of every manly, upright, steadfast and loyal virtue, shining amid the darkness of error and misconception, perverted from the nobler cause of which they were the fitting ornaments, to glorify with undeserved lustre the efforts of illiberality and tyranny. There can be no doubt of the righteousness of that remarkably bloodless change of dynasty by which the Stuart line went out and the Hanoverians came in. And gladly enough might the admirers of Claverhouse have hailed the opportunity of emblazoning his name among the friends of the new order of things.

Whatever amount of mean-spirited conduct disgraced the change of administration—as such charges are inseparable

uch faults—yet good, wise, and honorable men aided
ætted it from pure motives, and among them this Scot-
ntleman could have taken his place without mistrust or
ay. Still he would not have been John Grahame
verhouse had such been his course; and we need not
as we enrol him among the followers of King James.
nd somewhat too stubbornly, even in the wrong, by the
and patron of long years; to maintain an obstinate faith
through the evil report of the world; to abide with
nd go down to ruin with him, may be an error,
xcept in cases of monstrous iniquity, it is an error
generous men are prone to pardon, almost to admire;
t it is an error which an ardent and grateful tempera-
unless controlled by a cool and logical head far beyond
dinary, will be almost sure to commit; and it is hard
lge ill of one who follows such almost imperative
tings of nature. Claverhouse's head was excellent in
y, but he was no philosopher in matters of either
ı or state. The light which was in him was only twi-
but he used his best vision in it. So he followed the
s of a temper of character and a force of mind which
ı had given him, and which, no more than the rest of
uld change for the better. It was not that he loved
ism, or was the voluntary tool of tyranny; he
he most audaciously independent of men. But he
d with peculiar feelings, and from a stand-point quite
nt from that of the apostles of liberty, the rapid and
ıg panorama which the busy months unrolled so fast
ı his eyes. He could not root out the principles which
een instilled into him from early youth; nay, more, he
see no reason for doing so. To doubt the dogmas of
y was to him scarcely less heinous than to question
ruths of Christianity. Certain venerable beliefs had
d themselves into the grain of his soul; certain preju-
had grown a part of his character, and they were not
able in life. His anointed sovereign was only less
han his God. He saw and regretted sundry errors in the
ient of his monarch, but disloyalty for such reasons was
ı horrible as sacrilege. His political and religious sen-
ts, as well as his virtues, were those of the cavaliers,
ere now growing perchance somewhat antiquated, but
uld not cast them off like worn-out clothes. And in
g, since we have used that phrase of motley character
lier," we may remark that the too cavalier-like vices

of drunkenness and debauchery were never imputed to him even by his foes. "The hell-wicked-witted Grahame of Claverhouse hated to spend his time with wine and women." Thus rails that good whig Patrick Walker with savage ire at this unfortunate being, whose very virtues exasperated his enemies no less than his more questionable traits.

So Claverhouse clung fast to the foundering ship of state, guided as she was by the insane hand of her royal helmsman, blind with wild enthusiasm, stricken evidently with that terrible disease which the gods inflict upon those whom they wish to destroy; and even the faster the poor craft drove amid the whirlpools and the breakers, still the firmer grew that steadfast clutch. The last months of his life are fit only for romance; the philosophizing historian can only condemn, while the warm-hearted poet must inevitably admire. Moreover, the physical matter, the events, the scenery, are full of the wild picturesqueness of the age of chivalry. A brief skeleton sketch of them would too much resemble that profanation which an argument is to a beautiful poem. Suffice it, then, to say that on the news of the landing of the Prince of Orange, Claverhouse with his cavalry rode post haste for London. On his route he was in good time made Viscount Dundee by the king, whose patents of nobility were in a few days to be only waste paper. But James took a step excellent for his kingdom, since it probably saved a cruel civil war, but ruinous to his party as such, in fleeing from the realm. Straightway most of his partisans sought and found their safety in a swift transfer of their valuable allegiance to the invader. But Dundee was made of different stuff. Alluring overtures came to him thick and fast from the camp of William. The appreciation put upon his services was most flattering. He was known to be the military staff upon whom the exiled monarch pre-eminently rested, and hoped hereafter to rest. Hardly any price seemed too high to bid for so formidable an adversary. But the haughty soldier was not to be tampered with; deaf and dumb to the emissaries of bribery, he turned his back on the South, and rode off to see what could be done for the cause at Edinburgh. But here again he found cold comfort. The tide was strong against him. Moreover, the wynds and alleys of the Maiden Town hid the scowling brows and savage visages of murderous Westland whigs—covenanters of yore—who gnashed their wrathful teeth as the old persecutor rode by them, and swore fero-

y to have his blood. The city was too hot for him; a
hot, rendered doubly tempting by a certainty of indem-
might at any moment cut the last artery wherein still
ed the life blood of the Jacobite cause. So one fine
ng he galloped through Edinburgh streets at the head
y horsemen, through the Netherbow Port, away quite
reach of the respectable train-bands, who gaped as-
ed behind him to the tolling of the alarm-bells. The
nt was off for the Highlands.
the Highlands he found adherents warmer, even, than
who, in a generation afterwards, fought at Culloden
Preston Pans. Gentle and simple were to a man for
uart dynasty. Time, however, and trouble were ne-
y to fit the "bonnets of bonnie Dundee" for action;
is the dilatory Orangemen, who did not much fancy
asion of the Highlands, obligingly gave. And when
General Mackay mustered courage to advance, Dun-
unted 1,800 claymores at his back, besides his troop of
se. Mackay, making his way cautiously, came to the
r and rugged pass of Glen Girnaig; he knew that Dundee
ar; and he was thankful and puzzled as he saw the last
ns of his army filing safely out of the jaws of this chasm,
he had feared would prove but a Valley of the Shadow
ath to them. But he read neither the motive nor the
f his opponent. Dundee meant to take him in a bog;
nted a fair battle-field and a decisive victory, for he
well the prestige that this would give him, and how
able it would prove. So, on the famous field of Killie-
e, the hostile lines faced each other. The declining
not its rays full into the eyes of the clansmen; and
e, with whom it lay to begin the attack, calmly waited
o sink. In the lingering crepuscule of that northern
t was eight o'clock before the charge was sounded.
the harsh bagpipes animated the "children of the
to the conflict, and their own dissonant yells aided
excitement. The droll leathern cannon, named from
inventor "dear Sandie's stoups," belched and puffed
burd vigor against them. They discharged their fire-
only once; then with the target and broadsword they
d in personal fray with their antagonists. Dundee
ell calculated that he should have time enough. The
that the regulars stood their ground was only to be
d by minutes; their rout was as prompt as it was
ete. The slaughter was tolerably severe, but by no

means in proportion to the numbers engaged or to the magnitude of the victory; for the redcoats ran away with laudable activity, and their own legs rather than the mercy of the Gael saved them from annihilation. But Dundee lay mortally wounded with a bullet in his side upon the field, and the harsh yells of the triumphant clansmen were the requiem of the dying warrior.

In one sense, it was an untimely death; for he was at the very threshold of those years which are usually called the prime of life, and full of the vigorous health and the high hope of youthful days, already scarcely passed fairly away, and the talent which he was allowed to possess was now, perhaps for the first time, about to find a field large enough for its due exercise, and prominent enough for its fit display. Still, it was the death of the soldier; it was generous, and therefore beautiful; it was loyal, and therefore honorable. Had he lived longer the tale might have been more brilliant, but must have been more sad. The poet tells us that his is the only death which can be met with pleasure; and his last words were of joy at the gallant victory.

> "Thus, amid the battle's thunder,
> Shot, and steel, and scorching flame,
> In the glory of his manhood,
> Passed the spirit of the Græme."

ART. IV.—*Communication from the Comptroller to the Common Council, January, 16, 1865, relative to Gas Contracts. Pamphlet 8vo. pp. 15. New York.*

IT is a singular characteristic of our people that while none set a higher value on justice and liberty, none submit so quietly to imposition and fraud. We have a horror of despotism in name; but, in general, we rather admire despotism in reality. If we had a personage in Irving Place who called himself a prince, or a grand duke, a shah, or a sultan, who levied a heavy tax on every house, raising that tax whenever he thought proper, without putting himself to the least trouble as to whether we were willing to pay it or not, we should be apt to think that we were badly treated, even though he might condescend to tell us, if we sent in our petition in due form, that instead of grumbling we ought to be very thankful for the valuable services which he rendered us—services which, far from being dear, were remarkably

cheap; especially when we take into consideration the fact that they were such as we could not do without.

Let us suppose, for the sake of illustration, that the following colloquy takes place: Citizen: "Your Highness, I think it very hard that my taxes have been raised three times during the present year without as much as giving me a day's notice of the fact." Grand Duke: "But we could not take proper care of you without doing so; even at the increased rate of which you complain we lose rather than gain by the service we render you." Citizen: "That is rather bad, your Highness; but if you are losing instead of gaining, how is it that you admit, yourself, you are worth nearly $5,000,000, whereas when you first commenced you were worth only $500,000? Indeed, your Highness, it is more than suspected that your accumulation is much greater than your ministers proclaim, the same as it was suspected when you commenced that your treasury did not contain half the amount represented." Grand Duke: "You are impudent, sir! you must pay the full amount or my *gendarmes* will deal with you as you deserve."

This does not in the least exaggerate the conduct of our gas monopolies; or the despotic control they exercise over our citizens. They are allowed to manufacture as bad gas as they choose, and to charge our citizens their own price for it; but not content with this, they bribe Aldermen and Councilmen, to enable them to violate their contracts with the city, so that they may charge as exorbitant a price for lighting the public lamps as they do for lighting private houses. If any one dares to comment on the fraudulent and oppressive conduct of our gas monopolies, the distinguished officers of the latter, like the authors and publishers of stupid books, are sure to discover that he is actuated by *malice prepense;* he is but a calumniator and a libeller; but they, conscious of their own rectitude and fair dealing, treat him with an air of injured innocence, and magnanimously decline to prosecute him for libel. Even if a member of the Legislature, endowed with more courage than his neighbors, and disposed to protect his constituents from imposition, attempts to introduce any measure to control our monopolies, he, too, is charged with being actuated by vindictive motives. For the present we can only allude to these facts; but we will note some particulars as we proceed in this article which, we think, will satisfy any intelligent person that we do no injustice to the monopolists. We prefer

to let one of our public officers give his impressions first; because it cannot be pretended that he is actuated by any malice, since the very nature of his office requires that he exercise a careful supervision over the public expenditure. The duty of a comptroller is not merely to certify accounts, as certain parties seem to think; it is also his duty to *examine* those accounts, and see that they are not only accurate *per se*, but that they have resulted from legal contracts. We are aware that it is one thing for an officer to be supposed to perform a certain duty, but another very different to reduce that supposition to reality. None understand this better than our gas monopolists; they are, however, but little used to restraint of this kind. Hitherto they have had all their own way, although, no doubt, they have sometimes had to pay more or less for the privilege. It is but natural therefore that they should feel somewhat indignant against those who venture on so serious an innovation as to thwart them in their speculations; and we learn that accordingly they feel very much disgusted and annoyed. But we will allow the spoiler of their recent plans to state the case in his own words. The communication of the Comptroller to the Common Council commences as follows:

"GENTLEMEN—Having carefully considered the resolutions adopted by your predecessors the late Common Council, providing that the existing contracts for lighting the streets of the city of New York with gas shall be terminated, and new contracts made according to the terms which the *Gas Companies having the exclusive control of the business shall offer*, and having come to the conclusion that the resolutions are not only a violation of the rights and interests of the Corporation and against public policy, but are an invalid act of municipal legislation, and that it is my duty to prevent them from going into operation so far as falls within my province to do so, I herein lay before your Honorable Body the reasons which control me in this decision."

The resolutions by which the existing contracts were sought to be set aside, and which were passed by the late Common Council, on the 30th day of December, 1864, are here given by the comptroller; but it is needless for us to reproduce them, although they are curious specimens of English as well as of legislation. Suffice it to say that they did all they could for the gas companies. We now let the comptroller proceed with his remarks:

"The first branch of the subject—that which relates to the right of the Corporation to annul a contract beneficial to the city, having several years to run, in order *that another contract may be made, to the sacrifice of the interests of the city, and for the benefit of the contractor, and practically on his own terms*, without reserve or limit—relates to the Man-

alight Company, that being the only company with which the on now has an outstanding contract. The other parts of the ll be considered in their order.

Manhattan Gas-light Company was incorporated by a special Act islature, on the 26th day of February, 1830. On the 8th day of , the Corporation entered into a contract with that Company l the streets, avenues, and public places north of a line com- t the East River, at the foot of Grand street, and running rand street to Sullivan street, through Sullivan street to Canal l through Canal street to the North or Hudson River, at a year- not exceeding fifteen dollars for each lamp. This contract numerous provisions for the protection of the interests of the y its terms was to continue until the 12th day of May, 1853. day of May, 1848, *five years before the time fixed for the ex- f this contract the Manhattan Company obtained another and ntract from the city*, virtually abrogating that then existing, the Company contracted to light the streets of the city, from ine at Grand and Canal streets, but limiting the northerly to Forty-second street from river to river, it having been found le to the Company to be under an obligation to light the outer f the city, then sparsely occupied. This contract stipulated me price per lamp, fifteen dollars per annum, should be paid, he number of hours during which each lamp should be kept two thousand three hundred. By the terms of the first men- tract, all repairs of the streets, when broken or opened to lay ipes, were to be made under the direction of an Inspector ap- the Street Commissioner, whose services should be paid for npany. The new contract stipulated that the Inspectors ap- superintend these repairs of work done for the benefit of the *hould be paid by the Corporation of the city—an important ense each year*, if the innumerable occasions for inspection erly attended to. Other provisions of this contract, having re- nother branch of the question, will be referred to in their ap- lace.

st-mentioned contract was to continue until the 12th day of May, has three years to run from the 12th day of May next. I may cidentally, that the calculation of two thousand three hundred ach lamp per annum was made on the basis that the moon fur- s at certain periods to an extent which rendered gas-light un- but on the 31st day of December, 1853, the Common Council rdinance which ignored the existence or utility of the moon, rily fixed the hours during which the gas should be kept burn- light nights and others the same—by which the number of lamp was to burn was increased to three thousand eight hun- ar, and the Manhattan Company under the carefully guarded of their last-mentioned contract, became thereby entitled to *nty-four dollars and eighty-seven cents for each lamp, instead llars, and have* practically received twenty-five dollars for each that date to the present time. The operation of that ordinance the whole City was *to increase the cost of lighting the same lamps one hundred and thirty-one thousand dollars in a single* st period of a comparatively limited number of burners."

this we see that the Manhattan Gas Company knew erience that even if it cost them some fifty thousand the shape of "presents," to set aside the existing

contract, the amount would be safely invested. We exaggerate nothing when we say that if the job could have been completed, as contemplated by our late worthy Common Council, it would have been worth a million dollars to the monopoly at Irving place. Let those who doubt this only reflect for a moment, how long it would take to amount to that sum, even at the rate of $130,000 a year, the sum realized, according to official statistics, by the bargain of 1853. The comptroller continues to explain:

"The position of the question, so far as the Manhattan Company is concerned, is simply: That the City, by solemn contract, had the right, on the 30th day of December, 1864, the time the resolutions under consideration were passed, to have all the public lamps lighted at a cost for each lamp of a fraction over half a cent per hour, and this right, by the terms of the contract, was to continue until the 1st day of May, 1868, the resolutions of the Common Council, *without any consideration, cause, or reason, for none is expressed or pretended to exist*, surrenders and gives up to the Company this obligation, proposes to forfeit all the benefits and advantages acquired by the contract, and which are to continue so long, and practically surrenders all the interests of the City to the Company, authorizing it to charge *such amounts as it shall choose, for there is no competition—there can be none—under the proposed arrangement.* The Company, for aught that appears to the contrary, may charge *ten or a hundred times as much as at present, and thus saddle the City with burdens and increase of taxation to a corresponding extent.*"

The closing observations of this extract form a sad commentary on our laws. There is not one of the great cities of Europe whose gas companies are allowed similar power. Even in St. Petersburg they are bound to allow a certain number of cubic feet of gas for a certain amount of money; and if they attempt to transcend this rate they are liable to be prosecuted as extortioners. The same is true of Paris and London. A literary gentleman who has resided in the latter city for several years, and who has fully investigated the subject writes to us as follows, in reply to certain inquiries: "In London five cubic feet of gas, estimated at an hour's fair consumption, is expected to produce a flame equal to the light from twelve sperm candles, each burning 120 grains per hour. In Scotland where more cannel coal is used than in London, the flame from five cubic feet of gas must be equal to eighteen sperm candles. In England and in Scotland, *the law is that the gas supplied shall not be below* that illuminating power, and any consumer who thinks the gas of inferior quality can call in a sworn examiner to test it. If it be below the legal standard the consumer may summon an appointed officer of the gas company before the magistrate of his district, prove his case by the examiner's re-

port, and the magistrate can fine $100 for each offence—the delinquent company also defraying the examiner's charges. Otherwise, you see," continues our intelligent correspondent, "the consumer might be supplied with gas that is impure and therefore injurious to health, or with gas that is bad in quality and therefore involving the necessity of consuming a larger quantity to produce a certain light." That is, all might happen which really does happen in New York, and which is not altogether unknown in Philadelphia, Boston, or Baltimore.

Before the commencement of the present rebellion the citizens of New York had to pay for their gas, nominally about three times as much as the citizens of London, but really four or five times as much. That is, the latter were charged 4s. 6d per 1,000 cubic feet of gas, which the law required to possess a certain amount of illuminating power, while the former had to pay $2.50 per 1,000 cubic feet for such gas as our monopolists thought proper to furnish. We believe that no change has yet been made in the London rates, but the citizens grumble because the Portsmouth gas only costs 2s. 9d per 1,000 cubic feet. They have petitioned accordingly, and we are assured that a bill is to be introduced during the present session, if it has not been introduced already and passed, reducing the rate to 3s. per 1,000 cubic feet.

But while in London and other European cities the rates are being thus lowered; in New York they are being raised higher and higher. It will be remembered that when the internal revenue law was first passed, our gas monopolies did their best to evade it and throw it with the rest on the shoulders of the people. Directly, they did not succeed in this; public indignation prevented them; but indirectly, and we think we may justly add, fraudulently, they have fully indemnified themselves; so that if there are any of our citizens who think they pay less now than $4.00 per 1,000 cubic feet, for gas of inferior illuminating power, they are greatly mistaken. But we are not yet done with the manly and straight-forward document before us. In denying that the late Common Council had any legal right to set aside the existing contract, the Comptroller observes:

"The officers of the Coporation, whether legislative or executive, are but the trustees of the people of this City, and have no right *to give away its property*, or its rights which are the equivalent of property. When a

contract is made by the Corporation beneficial to the City, its a vest in and belong to the whole people—it is a sacred trust in th their representatives, and cannot be sacrificed or given up *as a* or on any grounds—*of favor or otherwise.* Every dollar added t ation by any such act is a dollar proposed to be taken from the justly and illegally. The regular and *necessary burdens of our surely sufficiently heavy at the present time.*"

Having clearly shown that the Common Counci right to deprive the city of the benefits arising f contracts, the Comptroller proceeds to remark tha people of New York were disposed to confer p favors on public companies, there is no reason wh should commence with our gas companies. He think contrary that the latter should be the last; and w deny that he is right? Among the cogent reasons v assigns are the following:

"They are vast monopolies, having the exclusive control of th of furnishing our people with a necessity; they *have exacted a acting* their own terms, and the complaints of the people have received with any great favor or liberality. The stockhol reaped enormous gains, and the people have not prospered by a ponding liberality of their *virtual masters.*"

It is true that the wealthy portion of our citizens feel that our gas monopolists are their masters, but t is true of those living under the most exacting and op despotisms. It is the poor that are made to suffer; an complain, they do so in vain. Let them only fall into a the monopolists for three months, and no petty tyra oppress them more relentlessly than the despotism a place, which, however, is not a whit more unscrupulou avaricious than that at Grand street. In these respec is but little difference between the twain. They syn with each other, as despots generally do; nay, more latter, because there is no competition between thes polies; no rivalry; one has no danger to apprehend f other, as a royal or imperial despot generally has f neighbor. Accordingly, if one monopoly takes away th and allows no further light until the quarter's bill is p believe the other does the same; and if one requires a of from $5 to $10 from the poor man as a c of his getting gas, so does the other; although we sured that the New York Company is not altogeth acting in this respect as the Manhattan. In short, good reason to believe that at least three of our gas nies are in league with each other, namely the Ma

Company, the Metropolitan Company, and the Harlem Company. So far as we have been able to ascertain, it is generally understood that the so-called Metropolitan and Harlem companies are in reality but the agents of the Manhattan Company. But let us see what is the origin and foundation of the power exercised in the manner we have described. The Comptroller presents us the facts, and draws the proper conclusions from them as follows:

"The first contract made by the Corporation to light the streets of our city was executed with the New York Gas-light Company, and bears date May 12, 1823. It recites that, in consideration of the covenants to be performed by the Company, the Corporation "*granted, demised, and to farm let*" to the Company the *right* of laying or placing underground pipes in all and every of the public streets and parts of streets lying south of a line running diagonally from the East River at the foot of Grand street to the North River at the foot of Canal street, for conducting gas for *lighting the public lamps in the streets and parts of streets south of said line, and the houses and buildings fronting or to front on, or bounded by, the streets or parts of streets south of that line.* It then provided for numerous conditions and restrictions under which the grant was to continue, and it was expressly stipulated that if the Company did not faithfully perform its contract, and all the covenants and conditions therein contained, "the premises" thereby "demised *shall be revested in the Corporation*" as fully and "*completely as if this indenture had not been executed.*" This contract continued until the 12th day of May, 1853, and expired on that day by its own limitation. I hold that, by the provisions of that contract, the exclusive right of the city to control the public streets for the purpose of laying gas-pipes and furnishing gas was distinctly recognized and established, independently of all other considerations, and that the contract amounted only to *a lease of the use of the streets* for the purposes of the Company during the continuance of the contract. The contract having expired by its own limitation, the exclusive ownership of the streets reverted to the Corporation. All the contracts made with the Manhattan Gas Company and that with the Harlem Company *contain the same provisions in this respect—word for word.*

"This recognition of right and ownership by the Corporation in the streets in connection with Gas Companies is an important and valuable property, *and may be turned to very profitable account in charging these Companies in the future an annual rent*, or other adequate consideration, for their further use of the streets, which they have turned to such useful advantage, without any compensation heretofore to the people."

If the Common Council would only exercise the rights thus proved to exist on the part of our city, then, instead of domineering and exacting monopolies such as we have now we should soon have that lively and spirited competition among our gas companies which exercises so salutary an influence in the principal cities of Europe. But all our public functionaries do not reason on the subject like the Comptroller. If the Street Commissioner were so careful and prompt in his attention to the streets as he has been in attempting to

carry out the wishes of the late Common Council and those whose interests they sought to advance, the city would be far from being as filthy as it is at present. Unlike the Comptroller the Street Commissioner asks no questions but proceeds at once to solicit proposals at the public expense for a new contract. His form of "proposals" seems to us drawn up as if our Commissioner were disposed to be as accommodating as possible to the monopolists. He addresses them as if they were unsophisticated, hard-working mechanics engaged in a laudable competition with each other, telling them that they "are required to state in their proposals their names and places of residence," that "each proposal shall be accompanied with the consent in writing of two householders or freeholders of the city of New York, with their respective places of business or residence," &c. Lest they might forget that there are many things which ought to be charged for besides the gas, he makes the following suggestions:

"Bidders are required to state the price for which they will furnish the gas, light, clean and re-glaze all the public lamps, and replace the cocks, tubes and burners, and cross-heads and lamp-irons thereto, in the district lying north of Seventy-ninth street, from the East River to the North River, for the term of one year. Stating the price, per annum, for each lamp.

Also, the price for which they will repair the lamp-posts, including either *straightening*, *re-leading* or refitting stand-pipes. *Stating the price per post.*

Also, the price for which they will remove lamp-posts, *stating the price per post.*

Also, the price for which they will fit up new lamps. Stating the price for each lamp.

The bidders are also required to write out the amount of their bids in their estimates, in addition to inserting the same in figures.

The number of public lamps in this district is about 3129.

The lamps burn on an average of 3833 hours and 20 minutes each, per annum.

The burners are to consume three cubic feet of gas per hour.

The amount of security required is $100,000.

All these suggestions may have the public interest and nothing else in view. Far be it from us to accuse Mr. Cornell of entering into a collusion with the monopolists; we know nothing of him further than we infer from his public acts, nor do we want to judge him by any other criterion. We cheerfully admit that a Street Commissioner may keep the streets in a very filthy state, while magnificently paid for keeping them clean, and yet be incapable of aiding the gas monopolies to cheat the city whose officer he is. We make no such accusation against him; although we are un

able to regard his conduct in this affair as altogether consistent with that sense of duty and stern integrity which the public has a right to expect from its officers. If we are wrong in this, we are not peculiar; the most intellegent of our citizens with whom we have conversed on the subject, use much harsher language in speaking of Mr. Cornell in connection with the gas companies, and his course is alluded to by the Comptroller as follows:

"There are still other objections equally strong to my attending the opening of the bids for the new contracts, or taking any action to give them validity. The invitation of the Street Commissioner, issued in pursuance of the resolutions of the Common Council, which is annexed, divides the city into four districts, being practically the districts in which the New York, the Manhattan, the Metropolitan, and the Harlem *have exclusive possession.* I do not find any authority for this division and formation of districts in the resolutions themselves. *The practical effect of it will be, that neither Company competing with the others, each will be at liberty to charge any sum whatsoever in its own district, no matter how exorbitant, and there will be no relief.* Whereas, if the invitation included the whole city, there might be competition, each being at liberty to override the other, and necessarily there would be a struggle for the advantage. It is true, inconvenience might be suffered while the pipes were being laid by a company not now in possession of certain districts; but I do not see how this inconvenience can be ultimately avoided *without an absolute surrender of the city to the gas monopolies on their own terms.*"

It may be that if the monopolies succeeded they would help to clean the streets in their respective districts, thus obligingly mapped out for them by our Commissioner. That some party would do the work effectually, were, indeed, very desirable; but the city pays pretty liberally at present; and since none know how to charge for their performances better than our gas monopolies, it may safely be concluded that if they lent a hand in the business of cleaning, it would prove dear work in the end. Those who do not understand this will be somewhat aided, in forming a definite opinion on the subject by the closing paragraph of the Comptroller's "Communication:"

"In order that a proper estimate may be formed of the extent to which the burdens of the city may be increased under the proposed new contracts, I would state that the bill for lighting the public lamps for the year 1864, according to the existing arrangements, amounted to about *four hundred and forty thousand dollars.*"

Thus, for the public lamps alone, the city has had to pay our monopolies nearly half a million for one year. The new contract would swell the sum to nearly, if not quite, twice that amount. But how many millions do our citizens pay for the

gas they burn in their private residences? Did we stat the approximate total in round numbers, we should see even to those who pay most and at the most exorbitant rat to indulge in oriental hyperbole. But a good beginning h been made towards putting an end to this state of thing If those who have the power will only carry out the sug gestions of the Comptroller, we shall soon have as cheap g as the inhabitants of European cities, who pay scarcely on fourth as much as we do.

But there must first be legislation. European monopoli would be quite as exacting and unscrupulous as ours if the were allowed. Our monopolies manufacture their own m ters, or have them manufactured to order. This will accou for the fact that almost invariably the latter measure five cub feet per cent. in favor of the monopolists—often as much eight per cent. In England the consumers had to compla of the same grievance, until an Act of Parliament was passe some years ago, which enacted that no meter could be set i future without bearing the seal of the inspector appointe according to law for that purpose. We have already allude to other enactments, the object of which is to protect the g consumers from the cupidity of the manufacturers. Wh cannot we have such enactments in this country?

In reply to this question, we say that much mo pains are taken to prevent legislation of this kind than th public would be willing to believe. Both money and g are devoted to stopping the mouths of those who would alt the existing system. Let a bill bearing directly, or ind rectly, on the subject of gas, be introduced either into th State Legislature, or into Congress, and straightway the Pr sident of the Manhattan Company is off to the capital t act as lobby member. At the same time he secures th aid of as many public writers as possible. His promises t these are magnificent. He only wants them to write a fe brief articles now and then, and for this they are to have all th gas they require free, as long as he is president. Nay, if the evince more than ordinary talent and ability in demonstra ing that the Manhattan Gas Light Company is a grossly ca umniated corporation, that will never get half the credit i deserves for its patriotism and self-sacrificing generosity they will be allowed coke, too, to keep themselves warm i their garrets. In making these fine promises, with the air o one whose chief objects in life are to encourage literature and vindicate the cause of truth, he takes occasion to im

press upon them that his own literary talents are of a high order; but that so heavy are the responsibilities resting on his shoulders, and so full of anxiety is his mind lest his fellow citizens might not have justice done them, that it is only in extreme cases he can take up his pen. When he does so, however, "the calumniators and libellers" may hide their diminished heads.

There is no reason why a writer as well as a speaker should not defend one whom he regards as his friend. It is as fair and honorable to advocate the cause of a client with the pen as it is with the tongue; nor is it a whit less honorable on the part of the one than it is on the part of the other to have more selfish inducements than mere friendship to exercise his talents. Literary men cannot afford to work for nothing more than lawyers; and accordingly we find the greatest intellects devoting their best energies to the gratification of their patrons. In proof of this it would be sufficient to mention the names of Virgil and Horace. If it be urged that they were Pagans, the same cannot be said of Kepler, Leibnitz, Bacon, Gœthe, Herder, &c. As literary people are not exempt from imposition more than those belonging to other professions, and are sometimes poor withal, it is not strange that the gas president has occasionally succeeded in yoking some of them into his service; a fact of which we have amusing evidence now before us in the shape of a series of communications written by that worthy functionary to one of our most esteemed contributors.

It seems that a morning paper had made some unhandsome comments on the Mahattan monopoly; and that our friend was directed to call on the company's lawyer to receive some suggestions, as to the plan of defence he should set up. Not sufficiently impressed with the fear of losing the gas, he is rather dilatory in obeying orders, and the gas president writes to him as follows:

"*Dear Sir:* I saw Mr. ——— last evening. He told me you had not called on him. Unless you do so without delay the opportunities will pass *for accomplishing the object I had in view.*

"When I see you I will explain what there is in the *Tribune* article that does us injustice, and shows the unfair manner in which this Company is to be *attacked.* If it goes much further I shall reply over my own signature."

If he replied "over his own signature," two important results would inevitably follow: that is, the "libeller" would

be confounded by the irresistible arguments brought against him and the poor scribe would lose his gas. But we must not omit the postscript to the president's letter, which is as follows: "If our collector calls on you again, refer him to me." What a fine inducement to call on the lawyer, take notes of what he has to say, prepare an article based on those notes, or try to reduce one already written to decent English, and publish it next morning!

Some time after, another communication, filled with "suggestions," is received from the same high quarter, which commences as follows: "Pond, of Rochester, introduces a bill to form gas and water companies." Our friend is expected to demonstrate that this is a horrible thing, and that every honest citizen should set his face against it; but he was so unmindful of his duty that he let the affair pass like that of the lawyer; although the communication which we have just quoted concludes as follows: "What kind of a legislature is this? *Is our Legislature itself a nuisance?*" That the legislature would bestow a moment's attention on any bill that would have a tendency to conflict with the interests of the Manhattan Gas Company, would be *prima facie* evidence that it was a "nuisance." It seems that our friend said something handsome on this subject. Probably he agreed that the legislature was a nuisance in some particulars; and that the press, too, sometimes does more harm than good by its impertinence to certain enterprising people. At all events, the next communication—addressed, "My dear Sir"—was full of handsome things, so far as words can be regarded in that light. After making some profound reflections on "the fickle nature of popular favor," the gas president displays his generosity as follows: "When you want fuel (coke) speak to my brother, the superintendent. * * * As to the gas bill, I will take care of that."

In order that our friend should not have to reproach himself with receiving so much value without earning it, at least in part, he is occasionally called upon to celebrate the military exploits, promotion, &c., of his patron. To qualify him for this duty he is furnished with suggestions, from time to time, such as the following: "I am now Major of the Veterans of the National Guard; the officers of this corps are chosen, irrespective of former rank, while in service, &c." It is proper to remark here that the gallant major has since been promoted to the rank of colonel, although we are not aware on what ground, except it be, that during a

whole week he was practising horseback riding in one of our riding-schools up town, he did not fall more than five times! We will also do him the justice to remind our readers that some two years since he went as far as Baltimore to the war, and would doubtless have gone further did he not know that we could not do without him at home. At all events, as soon as our gas president, colonel, &c., gained his point, that is, as soon as the threatened gas-bill was hushed up, there was no longer either gas or coke for our unlucky friend, who, however, might have fared differently had he made an onslaught on everybody and everything pointed out to him by his patron. We note this simply as an illustrative instance. When another "attack" was made, another writer was secured, who was in turn paid in gas, and with equal munificence as the former.

These two or three little facts will give some idea of the means which our gas monopolies have recourse to in order to perpetuate their despotism. Why, then, it may be asked, have we compared them to grand dukes, at the beginning of our article? and we must confess that the question is a very pertinent one, since nobody has ever heard of even the footman of a grand duke acting in the paltry manner above described. If grand dukes and persons of that description engage the services of literary men to help them to govern their subjects, we believe they rarely swindle them out of their labor and time.

Now, if there be any of our readers who are not aware that the gas supplied by our monopolies is of a very inferior character, are they so credulous as to think that persons who act in the manner indicated in these pages are not sufficiently unprincipled to furnish inferior rather than good gas, because the former is consumed much faster than the latter, and is consequently more profitable? The purer the gas is the fewer cubic feet are burned, and the greater the illuminating power; the more vitiated it is, the faster it burns, and the less is the illuminating power. In other words, when our light is worst we have to pay dearest for it.

Nor is it alone the poor to whom this is a matter of serious consideration; if the rich do not care to be cheated out of so much money, are they equally indifferent as to their health? Is it nothing to them that their books, paintings, furniture, &c., are destroyed in a very short time by the adulterated gas? The most deleterious impurities in coal gas are sulphuretted hydrogen and carbonic acid. In speaking of the former as im-

purities in coal gas, an eminent French chemist observes: L'hydrogene sulfuré a une odeur desagréable; il noircit l'argent, le cuivre, &c., &c.; *il exercise sur l'économie animale une action dangereuse.* Ce gaz et le sulfure de carbone donnent, en outre, lorsqu'il brûlent, du gaz sulfureux dont l'odeur est, *non seulement désagréable* mais *encore nuisible,** *&c.* Speaking of the same substances, Sir Humphrey Davy observes, that "they exercise a corrosive action on walls, furniture, books, pictures, &c., and are decidedly pernicious to health." Still stronger, if possible, is the testimony of Professor Turner: "Hydrosulphuric acid (sulphurretted hydrogen) is a colorless gas, which reddens moist litmus paper feebly, and is distinguished from all other gaseous substances by its offensive taste and odor, which is similar to that of putrefying eggs, or the water of sulphurous springs. Under a pressure of 17 atmospheres, at 50°, it is compressed into a limpid liquid, which resumes the gaseous state as soon as the pressure is removed. *To animal life it is very injurious.* According to Dupuytren and Thenard, the presence of 1-1500th part of this gas is instantly fatal to a small bird; 1-1000th killed a middle sized dog; and *a horse died in an atmosphere which contained* 1-250*th of its volume.*" †

Now in no gas in the world is there a larger proportion of these deleterious substances than in that of our monopolies, if it can be said that any other contains so much. Any intelligent person can see for himself, by the following simple process, what a large proportion of each there is in the gas of the Manhattan monopoly: 1. Shake a portion of the gas with lime water in a phial. If carbonic acid be present the water will become turbid by the formation of carbonate of lime. 2. Wet a slip of paper with a solution of sugar of lead, and while still wet, expose it to a stream of the gas. If sulphuretted hydrogen be present the paper is immediately blackened.

Having now shown how our monopolies get their contracts; how they falsify public opinion; how they influence legislators; in short, how they defraud our citizens by every means in their power, we take leave of the subject for the present; but until a reformation is effected we shall not fail

* Sulphureted hydrogen has a disagreeable odor; it blackens silver, copper, &c.; it exercises a dangerous action on the animal economy. This gas, and the sulphuret of carbon, produces, besides, during combustion, sulphurous acid, the odor of which is not only disagreeable but deleterious.

† Turner's Chemistry, p. 258.

rn to it whenever we see any good reason to believe
ır legislators and public functionaries can be persuaded
heir duty and dethrone as unscrupulous and tyrannical
otism as ever oppressed and insulted an intelligent and
d people.

V.—1. *Defence of Christianity;* By EDWARD EVERETT. Bos-
14.

ches and Addresses; By EDWARD EVERETT. 3 vols., Boston,
—1850—1859.

gressional Debates, 1825–7—1832–3.

gressional Globe, 1833—1835.

omatic Correspondence, 1841—1845.

cutive Documents, 1826—1835—182–3.

h American Review, 1820—1865.

ch in Faneuil Hall; By EDWARD EVERETT, 9th January,
. Boston, 1865.

veteran orator stood in Faneuil Hall, at the mid hour
inter's day, surrounded by an expectant audience, proud
and warm with enthusiasm for the cause which had
t him and them to that parliament of the people. That
pearance of Edward Everett was an appropriate culmi-
of a long life of honor and usefulness. Boston's chosen
pleaded for charity to suffering Savannah, beneath
shes of the old cradle of the Union. As he ascended the
m, a tribute of applause, such as no other speaker could
nd, greeted him. The occasion was well suited to
culiar powers. It did not require logical demonstra-
or comprehensive wisdom, but a hearty, patriotic
of invocation. A more glorious cause he could not ad-
. He stood there, stretching forth his hand over the
iver of blood, to grasp the extended hand of the returning
ns of the Empire State of the South. He never went so
to the heart of his audience and to the marrow of his
t. For an hour he electrified and enraptured. If any
n that hall had before doubted the orator's power over
lience, he laid his doubts aside when Everett paused.

That entire audience, to a man, were ready to rush to the relief of suffering Savannah.

This was his last speech, and it was worthy the orator, the time and the occasion. The 'old man eloquent' stood the last of a noble race of New England orators, a colossal figure surrounded by the ruins of time and the havoc of decay. He was a splendid specimen of what American civilization in its best influences can do. He had risen from humble origin to fame and glory. He spoke to a listening world. He represented all America in the literary council of the nation. He was as well and honorably known in France, in Germany, in Italy, as in his own country. Without station, or official power, a plain citizen, in the simple attitude of a patriot scholar, he occupied in the lists of genuine heraldry, a higher place than any monarch of the globe. In less than a week from that crowning effort he terminated his mortal career. The heart of the American people stood still at the sad intelligence. The executive of the nation announced his death as a national calamity, and proclaimed the nation's regret at the loss of its most eminent citizen.

His life and his labors are possessions of which the American people may well boast. His moral, intellectual, and political character was not only the treasure of Massachusetts, but of the whole nation. Both the public and the private life of Mr. Everett was crowded with useful and honorable deeds. He was, from early to latest life, a great student, an elaborate writer, and a public orator, always busy and always devoting himself to the public good. The labors of the closet must have been immense; but the contemporary labors of the platform, the senate house, and the official station were stupendous. It was truly marvellous that a man of such scholarly habits and recluse tastes should have united such public activity and preserved himself so well to the ripe age of three score and ten. It will be conceded by all that no stain ever sullied the character of the illustrious deceased; no base act, no mean act, no perverse act, has ever been charged upon him. He was honest, honorable, truthful, and magnanimous. His want of strict originality, of comprehensive mental view, of vigorous, logical grasp of a subject, and deficiency of imagination, were compensated for, and made comparatively dispensable, by acquirements equalled by no scholar of this country, and an industry assiduous, untiring, and life-long. What general learning Everett did not possess, it may safely

e assumed, was not worth having. In scientific specialties thers were, doubtless, his superiors; but in the extent, curacy, and depth of his miscellaneous learning, Mr. Everett was certainly the first scholar of our country.

But the peculiar merit of this eminent man was, that ucated in the most select schools, he devoted his learning t only to the schools, but spread it bounteously to e world. Little acquainted with men in their every- y garb, he still preserved his sympathy with the masses the people. Holding station nearly all his life, he ver was an office-seeker, or a panderer to official greatness. academician, he sought fame, influence, and applause with body of his fellow-countrymen. This was a memorable ibition of the true democracy of scholarship. He is the t illustration on our records of a republican scholar. The alth of eulogy which has been lavished upon him attests a sense of the nation's bereavement. We lament the loss an accomplished scholar, a useful citizen, and the most spicuous literary ornament of the Republic. Edward erett occupied a peculiar position in American letters. But European aspect there was no citizen of this country, at time of his death, who held a more truly representative ition. Irving, in letters, Prescott and Cooper in history, l passed away; Webster, Calhoun, and Clay in statesman- p were no more. Everett had survived them all, and od almost alone of the greater age of this country, and nded the public man and the scholar in a rarer combina- n than any of these.

To any review of Edward Everett making the most distant ims to completeness, these topics are essential: his natu- faculties and his acquired learning; the character, extent, d value of his labors. This involves a criticism of his aracter as a scholar, a thinker, an orator, a states- n, a diplomatist, a philanthropist, and a man. This ll present him in the chronological order of his career: as lergyman, a professor, a reviewer, an author, a legislator, premier, a minister plenipotentiary, a president of Harvard llege, and, lastly, as a public orator.

Graduating with the highest honors of Harvard, he settled a clergyman. He early attained the reputation of a bril- nt pulpit orator and a religious author of high repute. He tt became a professor of Greek Literature at Harvard llege. His political and secular oratorical career com- nced about the same time, in 1824—the latter by the

delivery of the oration before the *Phi Beta Kappa* Society of Cambridge, and the former by his unsolicited election as a representative to Congress from the Middlesex District. His career as a public orator was actively continued down to within less than a week of his decease, and will be well attested in the three royal octavo volumes of speeches and addresses already published, and the remaining materials scattered through the newspapers in sufficient abundance to make a fourth, and, perhaps, a fifth, of far greater value than either of the others. His labors as a writer, in contradistinction from his spoken performances, will furnish matter for many volumes of miscellaneous writings. It is on some accounts to be regretted that he did not devote himself to the completion of some more elaborate work, which could be esteemed as his greatest achievement. But the period of human life is not sufficient for all things. Such was doubtless his own desire, as he had devoted much time, for many years, to a treatise on the law of nations. He was, also, under engagement to deliver at the Cambridge Law School a course of lectures upon international law. It is not unlikely that these lectures would subsequently have formed a systematic treatise on the law of nations, published in the form of lectures, after the manner of the Commentaries of Sir William Blackstone.

American universities and literary societies vied with each other how most to honor America's greatest scholar; and both Cambridge and Oxford bestowed upon him the title of D. C. L. He was President of Harvard University from 1845 to 1849. From 1835 to 1839 he was governor of the commonwealth of Massachusetts. In 1841, he went to the Court of St. James as American Minister. He subsequently succeeded Mr. Webster as senator, and also as Secretary of State.

The youth and early manhood of Everett were ripe in useful toils. If his old age did not fully meet the high standard raised for him by others, in the magnificence of his labors and the unity of his efforts, it more than kept pace in the multiplicity of the works and the sustained vigor of the aspiration. He was as active to the last, as aspiring; as fresh and progressive as at the first. He was the best scholar at Cambridge when he graduated; he early achieved fame by his lectures upon Greek Literature. His career as a clergyman was short but brilliant. It is probable that he was more conspicuous as a pulpit orator than as

pastor. He early abandoned the pulpit for foreign travel, and the more congenial labors of Eliot Professor of Greek literature in Harvard University. His lectures on the "History of Greek Literature" and on "Ancient Art" early stimulated in New England a love for the noblest literature of antiquity; and their repetition in the neighboring metropolis, before popular audiences, inspired a similar spirit among the people.

It is an unchallenged truth that Everett carried elegant miscellaneous culture to the highest extent, permitted by the most untiring industry, aided by the amplest means, inspired by a true ambition, and crowned with a successful life. His education was not limited to the schools of America. European Universities were laid under contribution. Germany and England were the scenes of his studies. History, science, art, eloquence, and statesmanship were the high pursuits of his whole life. He was a complete English scholar. He was also a ripe classical scholar, and was thoroughly familiar with the leading modern languages.

He was without property himself; but a wealthy marriage made him pecuniarily independent. He was, therefore, never compelled to labor for bread. This afforded him the leisure and the means to indulge his taste for books, for art, and for elegant culture in all its branches; and he devoted himself to a public and oratorical life with a remarkable singleness of purpose. He was thus enabled to summon to his aid all the appliances of wealth, all the aids of culture, and all the spurs of promotion open to an American scholar. He collected a most valuable library. This was his home. It was, indeed, a sumptuous palace of literary treasures. A great library has its advantages and its disadvantages; Mr. Everett improved the former and avoided the latter. His books bear indications of careful reading. It was not a library for show, but for use. He did not merely draw from it; he had mastered it, and made its wealth his own. He held a literary correspondence with Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Hallam during their lives. He had, early in life, shared the hospitalities of Scott, at Abbottsford; he had seen Jeffrey and Moore and Byron in their prime. He had early visited Greece; he had been in France in its stirring and in its peaceful times. With England, Englishmen, and English society, he was as familiar as with his own countrymen and with American society. In our own country he had the advantage of intimate association with all scholarly men, and

the respectful confidence of the leading public characters. He held stations where he could learn with profit, and where he could exhibit his learning to advantage. He had the patronage of wealth, the advantage of opportunity, the aid of industry; and, added to these, a long life and a ready audience.

His speeches, writings, and conversation abounded in the fruits of such opportunity and such varied culture. He drew upon the resources furnished from such fountains to great advantage. They supplied much of the demand for original thought, and those mysterious resources of genius which need not education, travel, observation, or experience to impart to its fortunate possessor wisdom adequate to all wants and a power fitting all occasions. They did all they ever can do to make Edward Everett a great man.

The mental characteristics of this eminent American citizen, his merits and defects as an intellectual man, now demand some consideration. Turning from the wide sweep of his learning and the vast labors of his tongue and his pen to the consideration of his mental powers, his intellectual character, and his natural capacity and his genius, we come upon a more debateable subject. Among his admirers are those who moan his loss as one of the greatest intellects of the age. These regarded him as a genius whose equal has rarely been seen, and will not soon be seen again. He had, also, his detractors, who constantly lamented that they could not discover that he ever had an original idea in his life, or that he ever said anything entitled to an epithet beyond such as "elegantly beautiful," or "coldly correct." Many of this class were competent judges; but many more of them were utterly incompetent to pass judgment either on his merits or his demerits. It is certain that they failed to appreciate in any reasonable degree his ability, or to credit his capacity to any fair extent. And it is equally possible that the former class over-estimated his natural capacity, out of unwavering regard for his acquired ability. Many candid critics have under-estimated his qualities as a logician, from his great ability as a rhetorician. Others have hastily judged him incapable of great and long-continued labors because, by accident quite as much as by inclination, he devoted his energies to a comparatively light order of intellectual productions. Others, still, have claimed that he knew too much of books and relied too much upon the thoughts of other

to have formed many ideas of his own or thought much for himself. Let us attempt impartially to estimate the real intellectual calibre of the man, uninfluenced by either of these extremes of criticism.

The question is often asked, how he would have succeeded had he been less industrious and less learned; in other words, how much genius had he? His was certainly the genius of industry. All his writings indicate that he was possessed of sound common sense, and demonstrate that he was not destitute of a shrewd practical turn. But he was certainly not a philosopher, or a great original thinker, or a creator of ideas. There are few such men in a century; and he was not of them. He possessed more talent than genius; but his was an order of talent closely bordering upon genius; and if genius means no more than application and industry, he was a genius of the first order. But we know there is a genius which makes, creates, and discovers; which adds new truths to the stock of human knowledge. There is a second order of genius, which unites, combines, admires and beautifies. He undoubtedly possessed this second order of genius in a superior degree.

A man of genius can succeed respectably with very little technical learning-tact; talent and wisdom supply its place for him. But there is a substitute for genius in the union of great talent and elaborate learning. Everett carried that union to a high state of perfection. In some respects he would have been a greater man had he known less. We do not discover in his writings any evidence of very bold, or very independent thinking. He was always wise, prudent, and discreet. He never breasted the popular tide of ideas; but sailed with the current. He was never a leader, either in scientific, political, literary, or religious ideas. He guided no sect in learning; and he led no party in politics. But still he was a great man. He skilfully combined, adorned, and beautified useful ideas gathered from marvellous reading, from wide observation, and from clear but not deep thinking. But he rarely gave indication of that boldness which seizes upon new truths, and stamps the discoverer's image on the forehead of an age. If he was largely indebted to others, he always willingly acknowledged the obligation, and seemed rather proud of it. He did not set up his own individual mind against that splendid combination of the Greek, the Roman, the Mediæval, the French, the English and the American mind, which it is the province of the scholar to cultivate and to draw upon.

The memory is not a great, but it is a useful faculty. I was quick, accurate, and retentive. He seldom forgot w he had read, seen or heard. It extended so much to wo that it is said he could commit an address of his own com sition by a single reading of his manuscript. This extr dinary faculty would have been of great assistance to hi any department of intellectual life; but it was of espe service to him in his vocation as a popular orator.

He had some wit, and more humor. Although the w is not crowded with his witticisms, at times he enlivened table with sparkling remark if he did not set it in a roar. an orator he said no word which has rung as the wa word of the age, but he exerted an influence sel equalled. As a statesman, if he has initiated no policies, carried no measures which have shaped the national dest he was a useful, laborious and brilliant public man. If thinker, he has given no new turn to the ideas of mank he shaped, ordered and inspired the ideas of others. wrote some poetry, but this was not of an order to indi that he possessed, in large measure, the divine vision. rank in the school of greatness must be estimated not a from the native qualities of his mind. He is a splendid sp men, if not of the first order of greatness, certainly of s rior ability, achieved by laborious habits, diligent stu and a scholarly life.

Genius consists either in action and execution, or in c ception, in thought, or brilliant imagination, creating a w of its own. Everett was never placed in any situation quiring the germs of action, unless it was in the Senat the British legations, and during the few months he wa the state department. The two latter were in peac times requiring the urbanity of a gentleman and the cul of a scholar, rather than the intrigues of a wily, or the en of an executive diplomatist.

All the stations he held he adorned with the virtues o honest man, the graces of a polished scholar, and the fid of a faithful servant. He shed upon them more lustre t they conferred upon him. But he was not equally well su to them all, and consequently he did not succeed equ well in them. The office of Governor, was one of more s than substance at the period he held it. Beacon street State street ruled the politics of Massachusetts. Party tocracy sought in him a scholar who could adorn their c and make for them party strength with the masses: he

dered them valuable services but he never betrayed the people. Education and agriculture were the two great interests then rising into notice, and of these he was a zealous advocate and active promoter.

As president of Harvard College, strange to say he was not successful, scholar and enthusiast as he was with the young in all scholarly ambition. He felt that he was stooping to drudgery when he performed its routine duties; and after three years, which he declared took ten years from the best period of his life, he retired to the more congenial pursuits of a scholar and a tribune of the people.

When he was a member of the national house of representatives, he was useful as well as ornamental. He was unjustly accused of indulging in rhetorical flourishes, by those who had neither his rhetoric nor his learning; but the archives of the House demonstrate that he was as laborious and painstaking as if he were unable to do any thing better than attend a committee meeting. He was not a ready debater, because he had been without practice in extempore speech, and was too fastidious to trust himself to unpremeditated discourse. He was both too much and too little of a man to be an expert party leader. He was at the head of the committee on Foreign Affairs all the time he was in the House. With Henry R. Storrs he led the opposition to President Jackson's Indian extermination policy, and deserves to be held in perpetual remembrance for espousing the cause of an injured and oppressed people who had none to defend them. It was not in fierce debate, or in rancorous personal controversies, or in severe logical demonstration, or in astute party management that he excelled. He could not have been Peel, a Palmerston, a Douglass, or a Clay, if he had coveted their stirring lives. He made an impression on congressional literature beyond his set speeches. He was a laborious committee man; and his reports constitute the best models of logical reports in the archives of Congress. In the short period he served in the United States senate he did much to advance his fame to the first place in its rolls.

The state has in all periods of history been blessed with statesmen who in their quiet studies and cooler meditation have reflected upon the true policies of empire, and illustrated statesmanship with brilliant letters. Sometimes this service has been in elaborate treatises, as in the political works of Milton and Burke, and shorter, but not less elaborate pamphlets, as in the case of Swift, Jefferson, and

others. Mr. Everett was not a writer of political pamphlets, of great public works, or a political journalist, to any great extent, but the same order of work he effected by the numerous popular addresses of a public and statesmanlike nature, delivered by him through his entire life.

The intimate relation of the scholar to statesmanship was vindicated most thoroughly in the life and services of Mr. Everett. Such a man was Burke in British politics; and such also was Guizot in modern French politics. Mr. Everett was in all these labors the critic of the past; he did not guide the present or mould the future. He originated no philosophy of literary history, but he dressed the common theories of literary life in new and interesting forms.

His diplomatic services were both honorable to him and serviceable to his country. He was American Minister at the Court of St. James, from 1841 to 1845, and acted as Secretary of State for a considerable period after the death of Mr. Webster. The diplomatic papers of Everett may be placed, without disadvantage, beside those of the most distinguished diplomatists. They are of the literary class. George Canning is much nearer to him in tone and style than Castlereagh or Russell.

There were two occasions when he required the highest order of literary diplomacy, and he has left two documents which will hold an important place in our diplomatic records as long as any part of them remains in the memory of men. The one was his elaborate state paper, written when he held the office of Secretary of State, in Mr. Fillmore's administration, in regard to our policy as to the purchase of Cuba. The other was a short time prior, written during Mr. Webster's occupation of the State Department. It related to the conduct of our government touching the Hungarian war. This is known in diplomatic circles as the "Hulseman Letter". It was nominally a document of Mr. Webster's: but it is believed to be a well established fact that it came from Mr. Everett's pen. The facts, as we understand them, were these:— Chevalier J. G. Hulseman, the Austrian chargé d'affairs, under date of thirtieth of September, 1850, addressed a communication to the state department, complaining in rude terms of the conduct of the government of the United States in sending a private agent to Europe for the purpose of obtaining information as to the facts and prospects of the Hungarian insurrection. This was construed as an act o

unfriendly interference with the domestic affairs of the Austrian monarchy. Mr. Webster was not in good health at the time, and was besides burdened with excessive labors; and he was also about to take his summer journey to the North. He communicated the document to Mr. Everett at an evening's interview at Washington and desired him to draw a reply to it. The secretary left the next morning for his journey and it was agreed that Mr. Everett should subsequently meet him at his paternal homestead in Franklin, N. H., and submit to his inspecton the reply he should draw. This was subsequently done, and Mr. Webster was so well satisfied that he used Everett's draft substantially as he drew it. This letter is dated December 21st, 1850, and is published with Mr. Webster's diplomatic correspondence.* It is an elaborate document and places the policy of our government in relation to the free movements in Europe upon a truly American basis, while it administers to the representative of Austria such a castigation as has since saved us from any repetition of similar diplomatic impertinence.

The times in which he was a diplomatist were mostly peaceful rather than turbulent. How he would have succeeded in the storms of diplomacy there can hardly be two opinions among either his admirers or his detractors. He was by nature, inclination, and training unfitted for such a service at such a time. He would have been no match for the Richelieus, the Napoleons, the Talleyrands or the Metternichs of diplomatic history. He would have despised their duplicity, and scorned their meanness, but still he would have been no equal for them in the plots and counterplots of intrigue. It was therefore fortunate for him, and for the public interests, that the times required the wisdom of moderation and the refinement of elegant letters, rather than arrogance, duplicity, fraud or deception. As early as 1850, he announced that he hoped to be able to execute a diplomatic project, to which he had devoted a good deal of time for many years, and for which he had collected ample materials—that of a systematic treatise on the law of nations, more especially in reference to those questions which have been discussed between the governments of the United States and Europe since the peace of 1783. This project he never executed. He also contemplated a course of lectures on the law of nations at the Cambridge Law School, but he died before he

* See Webster's works Edited by Edward Everett, VI; 491.

had commenced their delivery and before he had advanced in their preparation beyond the composition of the first of the series. These works would have added to his fame as a statesman and diplomatist, and supplied an important desideratum in American public literature.

As a writer, an author and a literary character, he now demands review. After all that can be said of mere public aspects, the more pleasing attitude of Mr. Everett is in the calm quiet of his study. Here we behold the scholar at his labors; the academic orator in his laboratory. It is as a literary orator that Mr. Everett will live longest. He has left durable memorials of his efforts; this was his forte, and he doubtless felt it to be so. Many wondered that he could so actively devote himself so late in life, to such apparently ephemeral labors. But each speech was a new chapter added to the collection which was to carry him to posterity.

Considered purely as an author, Mr. Everett's life was a useful one. There was scarcely a field of writing into which he had not entered. He wrote no historical work, but his addresses abound in the highest order of historical narrative. As a writer of popular biography, his lives of Stark and of Washington were creditable performances; his life of Webster gave him rank with the best of American biographers.

Mr. Everett was for many years the editor of the North American Review; his collected articles from that journal will form a valuable portion of his miscellaneous works. He did not adorn his writings with great original ideas. His was the cooler survey of a scholar, bringing the treasures of elaborate culture to all he attempted. We do not witness in his pages the hard head of the logician, or the deep meditation of the metaphysician, or the great discoveries of the scientific master, or the comprehension of the originating statesman; but the beauty and grace of the cultivated scholar are seen in every page even on the most trifling topic.

The question naturally occurs as to how much mind such labors exhibit, in comparison with the great scientific thinker, the artist, the poet, the historian, the dramatist, the practical philosopher. His writings had in view the education and elevation of the American people; and it is probable that they had much influence in this respect. But it was not their elevation in great scientific truths, or practical philosophy that he aimed at. He rarely exhibits a new truth or a great prac

l one, such as abound in Franklin's writings. His mis-
was the popularizing of American literature. He sought
ring the people into communication with literature, and
ary literature to the door of the humblest man. Chan-
labored in the same field. These are useful efforts, but
as high on the lists of fame as those of the more ela-
te writers.

Whatever he touched he adorned. Some would not con-
to his productions the highest order of excellence,
er in thought or execution, simply because it bore
impress of Everett, rather than of some different mind.
have been accustomed to deride him as a small man,
use, forsooth, he had more culture and less strength
two or three other leading thinkers of our country, like
ilton, Jefferson, Marshall, Webster, or Calhoun. Others
tually put an under-estimate upon him from the char-
of most of his literary services. He is unfavorably
rasted with Irving, because he did not, like him, write
ry and romance; with Bryant, because he did not de-
himself to poetry; with Bancroft and Prescott, because
id not leave behind him great historial productions. We
t, in turn, as correctly complain of their short coming,
use they did not, also, make great orations, and entrance
enate house by their eloquence.

But it is as an oratorical author, that he is most conspic-
in authorship; indeed had he written nothing besides
poken addresses he would have ranked very high as an
rican author. If from his capacity as a thinker,
ecord as a statesman, and his labors as a scholar, we
to his capacity as a popular and academical orator, we find
h more to commend and much less to criticise. It is as a
lar orator that Everett is destined to live longest. This he
elf must have anticipated; hence the multiplicity, extent
elaboration of his contributions to this species of the lit-
re of oratory. From 1824 to 1865, he was the leading
ry and patriotic orator of America. Had he possessed
re compact and massive intellect he would have been
dapted to this work; for he would have been too heavy,
gical and too elaborate to interest, instruct and enliven
diences. His education enhanced this adaptation of his
e; his great elaboration and exhaustless industry; his
se and life-long enthusiasm for a vocation of which
men, capable of greater things, would tire in early man-
; his memory of words, his power of dramatic, pictur-

esque description, and his freedom from the cares and toils of active business; all these made it certain that he, if any one, ought to succeed in that work.

These labors were immense, the topics were numerous the discussions popular and oratoric, rather than logical and philosophical. Exact, exhaustive and elaborate treatment of a great topic, was simply impossible within such limits and before a popular audience. The ephemeral and gossamer nature of all spoken literature is obvious; it is adapted to the hour and it can rarely survive it. It has not the material of immortality. Everett's orations one hundred years hence will be read as models of literary oratory but not as depositories of thought and indices of great truths. Some of them will be deemed exceedingly ephemeral in topic and unimportant in occasion; but in regard to the most impressive labors of the orator, a careful reading will satisfy the candid critic how possible it is for a skilful rhetorician to dignify and decorate the most insignificant theme with charms seemingly quite foreign to mere commonplace oratory. there are, however, many others of a different and a higher order; and these alone are enough to establish a splendid monument of academical oratory.

He seldom or never made a speech or remarks of ten minutes' duration without carefully writing them out and furnishing a copy of his manuscript to the newspaper, and having the printed slip addressed to other presses before the delivery of the speech. This made a new era in spoken eloquence; but he mistakes who does not to the fullest extent avail himself of it. All men who seek to influence the public mind by speeches, beyond the immediate audience addressed, find such a plan necessary, not only by way of disseminating their ideas to the larger audience of the reading world, but also, as a means of protecting themselves against garbled reports and blundering statements.

He early entered and long remained in the field as a Lyceum orator. In these labors he aimed at educating a people, and they gave him a reputation for literary benevolence; but they impaired his standing with high-toned scholars and public men; and some among the people for whom he labored and sacrificed, were ungrateful enough to believe that he gave his tongue and his pen to the cause because he wanted the ability and lacked the energy for more profound investigations. He, however, had his two-fold reward: in the general esteem of all the

scholars who thought the scholarly character best illustrated when turned to the profit of the masses of the people; and in the grateful admiration of the masses who could appreciate the motive of his sacrifice and the value of his labors.

As an orator of our national festivals, he was of the highest merit. He labored most assiduously and faithfully in this direction from early to latest life. He did not write American history, but he popularized it. He made the American people understand the story of their fathers. Our national and local history had, before his day, been written with research and ability. He added little to this original stock; but he leavened the whole mass with the glow of a warm and hearty enthusiasm. He clothed the skeleton form in the garb of life. He was the oratorical artist of American history; he evolved laws of civilization as well as recorded mere events. He was the herald of our future as well as the chronicler of our past. The great west early warmed his imagination and inspired his eloquence. Foreign nations, struggling to be free, found in him a warm advocate; tyrannical nations found in him, if not a coarse and violent, still a firm and effectual check. Greece, Ireland, Hungary, Italy, bear witness to his eloquent tongue and warm heart. If he once flattered the representatives of Russia, while her hands were red with the martyr blood of Poland, it was because Russia had devoted herself to works of real civilization, and also because Russia was friendly to our country, and that we then stood in need of all her friendship as a counterbalance to England and France, each seeking a pretext for turning unfriendly feelings into unfriendly acts.

A speaker is, primarily, to be tested by his spoken word; not as he has it in his manuscript, or as it will appear in print, but as it comes from the mouth and falls upon the audience. A careful study of his art and mature preparation for each occasion, must be the rule in all such set occasions as those on which he appeared. He is said to have elaborately investigated and carefully meditated his subject and made his brief before he began to compose addresses, but the labor of committing to paper, artistic as that work appears to be, is said to have been rapidly executed. From the labor of composition in the study, let us follow him to the assembly he is to address.

The elegant oration is before him. It is like the finished

sculptor's work. It is said that it is already in his memory from the manual act of putting it on paper. He now presents himself to the audience; he is without a note or a brief. It is the perfection of recitation; it is the highest effort of mere acted oratory. Every word is well rounded. Every attitude is nicely balanced, with a view to each part and to the combined whole. The points are exquisitely made. The fervor is duly curbed, and never allowed to run to extravagance or fiction. The action is rich, varied, and chaste.

The address interests, but it does not electrify; it pleases, but it does not move; it is elegant, but is not mighty; it is grand, but it is not magnificent. It is the excelling beauty of a scholar's oratory; it exhibits the highest artistic perfection of academic eloquence. It is the scholar stooping to the masses. We occasionally feel that if there could be less art and more soul, it would rise to perfect eloquence. All this is art, but it is of the highest kind. We some times feel that if we could have a little more of nature, and less of art, it would entrance as well as delight us. The manner of Everett was peculiar, and amid many merits it had some defects. It was graceful, animated, elegant; but it was rarely forcible, energetic, impassioned; in a word, self-forgetful. The gesture was cold and artificial. His voice was pleasant but not forcible; yet it was agreeable, and never monotonous. He had more grace but less fervor than Choate; more elegance but less power than Webster; more artificial pomp but less dignity and ease than Clay, and less natural grace than Phillips. The tones of the voice, the height of the emotion, the vigor of the declamation, the fervor of the style, were all carefully measured.

There is probably no orator of this age from whose discourses so large a collection of beauties could be selected. He worked up brilliant passages with immense care; but elaborating brilliant passages, as such, constitutes one of those rhetorical artifices which must be carefully concealed or they lose their effect and fail of purpose. Any attempt to quote brilliant and beautiful passages from Everett, would be to make more than one quotation from almost every address he ever delivered.

His eloquence is, generally, the purest English. There is, however, occasional deviation from the severest standard in the palpable effort after brilliant passages. When such efforts appear often or habitually, they are a defect in any speaker's style. It may be pardoned in the spoken address;

the startling point may tell upon the audience, but on the printed page it will always fail of recognition as a correct specimen of art. He expresses the exact meaning, generally, in few and simple words, There is no repetition of the idea and no redundancy in the words. The style may often lack energy; but never grace, and rarely simplicity. He himself has confessed that it was the custom in his earlier day at Cambridge to admire Johnson, Gibbon and Burke, and that he yielded himself with boyish enthusiasm.

Although he had a pure ideal in style, he did not always follow its dictates implicitly. Simplicity he always professed to regard as the first excellence of style; but his style was not always simple, nor was it always free from extravagance.

Early in his public career he undertook to indoctrinate the American mind with a love for the virtues and an admiration for the sacrifices of our Puritan ancestry. This was needed, but it was subsequently carried a little to excess by those not so new in that field of literary labor. He never tired of recounting, in moving narrative and picturesque phrase, the story of the foundation and early life of this country. Had he only painted with as free a hand our ancestors' failings, denounced their narrow bigotry, their cold asceticism and their unnatural warfare upon their aboriginal predecessors, he would have given to American ideas, in their improved aspects, a lustre which would have elevated the moral and intellectual character of the people. Is is true that such topics would have been somewhat at variance with the festive character of most of the occasions on which he spoke; but wholesome truth and discriminating laudation are always excusable and seldom injurious. He would thereby have made the best use of the natural reverence of our people for our fathers, by teaching us to avoid their defects and their errors and to improve upon their ideas. He did not say severe things where truth required them. He indulged habitually in praise. He performed his mission however; it was as the orator of the past; had he lived fifty years longer he might or he might not have assumed the higher character of a critical guide and safe counsellor in American literature, American institutions, American ideas, American civilization, and American manners. He might thus have elavated the popular heart by telling plain, homely, but needful truths.

He always commanded a fair share of esteem; but until the present troubles of the country brought him more in

accord with the current of sentiment, he could not be called a popular man, in the vulgar sense of that term. He was a literary, long before he was a popular, idol. Mere popularity is no fair criterion of merit or ability; he shared the obloquy of Webster in his last years, and went down politically with the falling fortunes of the Whig party.

The last decade of his life was the most useful and active of the whole, and the labors of the last four of those years have enrolled his name higher than those of orators, and of most statesmen. His years and a constitutional timidity forbade that he should be called upon to render services with the sword, but had this been possible the scholar would have willingly become the soldier of the republic. There can be no divided opinion upon this period of his life. He was ever ready with his hand, his tongue, his purse, to serve the public. He was ever loyal, hopeful and active in the national cause. He saw the tendency of public events long before the war began. He saw the need of planting deep in the public heart the sentiment of nationality, to counteract the danger of sectionalism and the tendency to State independence. He saw in the home, on the banks of the Potomac, of the Father of our Country, the seed of a national sentiment which might be made a perpetual bond between the North and the South. He saw in the character of Washington the cement of national unity. He therefore devoted himself to unexampled labor for the purchase, at the expense of the people of all sections, of the Mount Vernon estate. He even condescended in his old age to become a weekly newspaper writer for the period of an entire year, to swell the subscription fund. Since this war has raged, he has ever been ready to say and do all in his power. The Union patriots of the South found in him a steady, rallying centre; our soldiers were proud of the praise of the great New England orator; and gallant tars were made to remember to their last breath the name of their benefactor and friend.

If ever Edward Everett was justly chargeable with coldness, these noble efforts and trying scrifices proved to the world that a recluse scholar can carry in his bosom a warm heart and a generous nature. If ever it has been suspected that he was a vain or an ambitious man, finding the motive for his activity in a desire, when years had crept over him, to see his name in the newspapers and keep himself before the public the same as in earlier life, all such must have acknowledged they did him injustice in such a suspicion when they

saw the liberality of his pecuniary contributions, and his humble practical labors, in ill health too, for the great cause. The $100,000 he helped to raise for suffering East Tennessee, and his later efforts in behalf of the suffering people of Savannah, indicate louder than any words the generous, honest, disinterested beneficence of the man.

We saw him the last time he spoke in that Hall, less than a week prior to his death, on the delivery of his plea for the suffering people of Savannah. Forty years had intervened since he began his career as a popular orator. He looked care-worn. His limbs and hands were tremulous. He rose amid peal on peal of welcome. Wit, wisdom, eloquence, pathos, followed in an affluent stream. The speech as printed is not so spirited as it was when delivered. There might have been occasions in his oratorical life of higher intellectual character; but there could have been none which reflects more credit upon his heart.

Ships were named after him; popular hotels sought his name; streets, children, were called after him. He has descended to the tomb full of honors and years, leaving a brilliant fame. If his life may safely be declared useful, and honorable, with how much truer significance may his death be said to have been fortunate and happy! He was born by no racking pains, wearied by no wasting disease, hurried by no accident or violence from earth; but almost unconsciously and instantly, as if by the prophet's translation, he passed from the highest scenes of earth to the still nobler scenes of heaven.

ART. VI.—1. *Opere di* NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI, Cittadino e Segretario Fiorentino. 10 vols. Milano, 1804.

2. *The History of Florence and of the Affairs of Italy from the earliest times to the Death of Lorenzo the Magnificent*, together with *The Prince*, and various Historical Tracts. By NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI. London: Bohn, 1854.

Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtschrieber. Berlin: 1824.

THERE is no more remarkable phenomenon of the human mind than the impressions made by the same object or expression on different persons. Those acted upon thus vari-

ously may be brothers; their education and training from infancy may be alike; yet they may form opinions diametrically opposite, even of what they have been eye-witnesses to. This fact is of the greatest importance in its influence on society, but it receives little attention; it is but rarely that any allowance is made for it. The different estimates formed of the writings and character of the famous Secretary of the Florentine Republic afford a striking illustration of this; for, while some regard him as branded with eternal infamy, others venerate him as a benefactor of mankind; and that there are honest, conscientious men among both parties is beyond dispute. The books written by the accusers and defenders of Machiavelli for three centuries and a half would form quite a library by themselves; but all have not been sufficient to decide the question at issue. The difficulty is the same in this case as in almost all others of the same kind; too much zeal and acrimony are displayed on each side.

It will be our endeavor in the present paper to examine all the evidence carefully and dispassionately, especially the work upon which his accusers condemn the author. Nor shall we merely give our impressions of what we find in our examination; we will present the reader with materials which will enable him to form an opinion of his own. Until we have made some progress in this undertaking, we will pass no judgment *pro* or *con*, further than to remark, that a man of undoubted genius, over whose grave the dust of three centuries and a half has passed, may well claim that even his acknowledged faults be treated with as much indulgence as the cause of truth, justice, and morality will allow.

Before we take any notice of Machiavelli's works, it will be proper to give a brief glance at his life, since all know how much depends not only on one's education, but also on the subordinate influences by which he has been surrounded in his youth. So far as we have any evidence, the best sentiments were instilled into the mind of Niccolo Machiavelli from his childhood until he arrived at mature age. Nor can it be said that the time or place in which he lived was of a character to account for his alleged want of principle. He was born in Florence in May, 1469, and among his contemporaries were such men as Ariosto, Guicciardino, Trissino, Cardinal Bembo, Leo X., and the elder Tasso. Dante and Angelo (the latter, also one of his contemporaries) were natives of Florence, but neither has been charged with any particular turpitude;

n the contrary, both are distinguished for their stern integ-
ty and uprightness of character. Nor was Machiavelli of
ean extraction. His family was descended from the an-
ent marquesses of Tuscany, and traced its origin to a Mar-
is Ugo, who flourished in the middle of the ninth cen-
ry. His ancestors were hereditary lords of Montespertoli;
d we are told that fifty members of the family were at va-
ous times elected prior, one of the highest officers of gov-
nment. Niccolo's father, Bernardo, was a jurisconsult and
asurer of the march. His mother, Bartolomea, was
ally well descended, being the daughter of Steffano Nelli,
ose ancestors were the ancient counts of Borgonuovo,
o flourished in the tenth century.

We are particular in noting these facts as to the de-
ent and family of Machiavelli, because many have inferred
m an observation in his dedication of the *Prince* to Lo-
zo de Medici, that he was of mean extraction as well as
or; we mean that in which he says: "If from your ele-
ted position you should condescend to look down on a per-
n in *my lowly station*, you will see how long and unworthily I
ve been persecuted by the extreme and unrelenting
volence of fortune." It is sufficiently evident from all
s circumstances, that he merely alludes to the misery to
ich he had been reduced by his enemies. We need hardly
serve, that, had the fact been otherwise, mean extraction
poverty would not have justified such base conduct as is
ributed to Machiavelli. What the sentence quoted from
s dedication goes to prove in reality, is that he set no value
hereditary titles or aristocratic descent. Nor was he the
t of his family who entertained views similarly democra-
. We have sufficient evidence of this in the fact that his
her had surrendered his titles and his prestige of an illus-
ous ancestry, in order to become a private citizen of Flor-
e.

All we learn of his mother is entirely to the lady's
dit. She was not only well educated, but possessed po-
al talent of no mean order. There is good reason to
ieve that it was she who gave young Niccolo the principal,
st the only instructions he received until he was ten years
. Indeed, some are of opinion that she was his principal
r until he was fifteen. Bayle tells us that he understood
little Latin, but that he was in the service of a learned
who pointed out beautiful passages to him in ancient

authors. and allowed him to insert them in his writings.* This is by no means a satisfactory statement. In one of the editions of his works now before us we have several essays written in the Latin language, and we have two drafts of his will in the same language, which are also from his pen. None of these is such as one who merely understood a smattering of Latin could have written. But had he left us no specimens of his Latin composition, his works throughout are so deeply imbued with the classic spirit, that it would have been impossible to consider the subject fully without coming to the conclusion that he must have been familiar with the language of Livy and Tacitus.

The learned man to whom Bayle refers as having enabled Machiavelli to seem learned if he was not so in reality, was Marcello de Virgilio de Adriani, one of the chief officers of the Florentine Court of Chancery. But this functionary had been the teacher of Machiavelli; the truth is that he took his former pupil into his service because he knew from experience that he was abundantly qualified for the position both by nature and education. He remained five years in the chancery office. During this time he devoted all his leisure hours to study, but, as we are told, without neglecting any of his duties. Then, if we believe that he entered the service of Adriani possessed of a liberal education, as most of his biographers tell, we are bound to conclude that the influence of five years' study on such a mind must have been great. But we have much better proofs of the fact in his writings than any syllogisms could afford. It will be well to bear this in mind in examining the charges preferred against him; we must not forget at the same time, that, although the tendency of education is to elevate the moral sentiments and to restrain the grosser impulses of our nature, there have been those who had the advantage of the best instructors, who availed themselves of that advantage so far as the acquisition of knowledge was concerned, and were also highly gifted by nature, that proved, nevertheless, to be bad men. Who, for example, had better opportunities in this respect than Nero, the pupil of Seneca? It was in vain the great philosopher and moralist endeavored to inspire his pupil with sentiments of justice and humanity; he could not save even his own life from the tyrant. The

* Il ne savait que peut de Latin; mais il fut au service d'un savant homme qui lui ayant indiqué plusiers beaux endroits des anciens auteurs lui donna lieu de les inserer dans ses ouvrages.—*Dictionnaire Historique de Bayle, art. Machiavelli.*

of Aristotle was not indeed a bad man; but that Alex- was guilty of more than one murder the victim of had been devotedly attached to his person, is beyond . Another illustrious example we find in the life and ter of Bacon. None have ventured to deny that the of the *Novum Organum* was liberally educated; but ucation did not restrain him from the most corrupt ces. Although these are exceptional cases, they are nt to admonish us that before we acquit Machiavelli charges preferred against him, we should have stronger ce in support of his innocence than the mere fact that ining had been good. But whatever instruction Ma- lli received from Adriani, it is certain that the more ter knew about him the more he esteemed his talents telligence; and that all who knew him in his youth l a similar estimate of him is equally well attested. when Adriani was promoted to the rank of high llor, he recommended Machiavelli as fully capable of ng his own former office, that of chancellor of the l court. There were four other candidates for this ; but Machiavelli was elected by a large majority. hows what his fellow-citizens in general thought of the time. If it be urged that the people at large t indifferent judges of the qualifications or merits of who ask their suffrages, we must admit the force of the ent; but we find that those who were confessedly the judges fully ratified the estimate of the people. In of this we need only mention, that in one month after avelli's election to the chancellorship of the second court, s appointed Secretary to the Council of Ten, a position of all others required most intelligence and ability, hich he held for fourteen years; until the democratic ment was overthrown by the return of the Medici to ce.

w let us see how had Machiavelli conducted himself these fourteen years. It is admitted by all that it his power to do much mischief to his fellow-citizens, been so disposed; that he could at least have enriched lf and his family is beyond dispute. But there is no ce that he availed himself of his position to do any in- o those whom he had best reason to regard as his ene- we have abundant evidence, upon the other hand, that ired from the secretaryship a poor man, whereas his essor had accumulated wealth in half the time. It was

not alone his duties as secretary Machiavelli was required to perform; he was also sent on every important embassy. He went four times as plenipotentiary to the French court, twice to that of the Emperor Maximilian, and twice also to that of the Pope, not to mention several minor embassies. His numerous letters, written from these different courts, are of great value. They are, indeed, not as lengthy as the letters of some of our modern secretaries; but, unlike the latter, they are replete with instruction on all subjects in which the Florentine republic could be supposed to have any interest. Nor do we find one remark or suggestion in these letters such as we should expect from the author of the *Prince*; on the contrary, the substance of his counsels is that the government should maintain a peaceful and friendly spirit in the settlement of difficulties; that it should provide for an upright and strict administration of justice; and, above all, that it should make the burden of taxes as light as possible.

But not only did Machiavelli instruct his fellow-citizens in statesmanship and diplomacy; he also taught them the art of war. "Let us observe," says Voltaire, "that the arrangements, the marching, and the evolutions of battalions were revived in Europe by one who was not a military man —by Machiavelli, a secretary at Florence. Battalions three, four, and five deep; battalions advancing upon the enemy; battalions in square, to avoid being cut off in a rout; battalions four deep, sustained by others in column; battalions flanked by cavalry—all are his. He taught all Europe the art of war; it had long been practised without being known."* Machiavelli was also the first of the moderns to indicate the most necessary qualities of a soldier. "First," he says, "he must have *gagliardia* (alert vigor), he must have a quick and sure eye, in which there must also be a little gaiety, a strong neck, a wide breast, a muscular arm, round loins—all indicating strength and agility. But above all," he adds, "a soldier must be actuated by honor; for war is but too great a corrupter of morals." The work in which these remarks occur is no mere pamphlet written for amusement, but an elaborate treatise in seven books, illustrated with plates, and entitled *Dell' Arte Della Guerra*. The main object of this work was to show the Italian people that they were able to recover their freedom without

* Dict. Phil., art. Battalion.

he assistance of the foreign mercenaries so generally employed in the states of Italy.

His Discourses on the five first books of Livy,* constitute another able work, the object of which is to show how a republic may be maintained and how it is exposed to ruin. We are told by Filippo Nerli, one of his commentators, that he was induced to write these discourses and those on the art of war by a number of young men who were in the habit of assembling from all parts of the city in a garden in the suburbs. Be this as it may, both works have attracted attention in every age; and among the writers of eminence who have availed themselves freely of the observations and suggestions which they contain are Montesquieu and Rousseau. So valuable are the discourses on Livy especially, that they would be extensively used in high schools and colleges throughout Europe and America, were it not for the prejudices entertained against the author for the reason already alluded to. For the same reason his history of Florence is little known, though undoubtedly one of the greatest historical works of modern times—a work which has excited the admiration of the most competent critics of every enlightened country. "In style and historic skill he is unique," says Frederick Schlegel, "worthy of the first rank of Italian, and indeed of modern, prose writers generally, and fairly comparable to the first historians of antiquity. With the energy, simplicity, and straightforwardness of Cæsar, he joins the profound reflection of Tacitus, and is more lucid than the latter. He has taken no one writer as a model; but, saturated with the essential spirit of classical antiquity, he seems to have made it a second nature to employ the forcible, animated, and appropriate expressions of the most brilliant ancient writers."† All competent judges give a similar estimate of the work; but, as we have said, it is rarely used in any educational institution, even in Italy. It consists of eight books, beginning with the year 1215, and ending with Lorenzo de Medici in 1492. It was undertaken at the suggestion of Pope Clement VII., but, like many great works, it was never finished. We see from the author's letters that he intended to add at least two books more to it; but death prevented him from carrying out his wishes. When he saw

* De' *Discorsi sopra la prima deca* di Tito Livio.
† Schlegel's Hist. of Literature, Lecture IX.

his end approaching, he made the best use he could of the materials he had collected, in presenting them to Guicciardini.

No historical works are written in a more serious style than those of Machiavelli. Those who read them would have little doubt that, if the author attempted to write anything for the stage, it would be a tragedy; but the fact was otherwise. His *La Mandragola* and *La Clizi* are the first regular dramas written since the time of the Romans, but both are comedies. "Il fit une comedie," says Bayle, "sur le modele des anciens Grecs, qui reussit admirablement." The Greek author whom he imitated in his plan was Aristophanes; and Voltaire preferred the imitation to the original. This is, indeed, exaggerated praise; it is a whim of the author of the *Henriade*, like that of preferring not only Virgil, but also Ariosto, to Homer. But were the *Clouds* of Aristophanes and the *Mandragola* of Machiavelli compared to each other, as to their results or the influence they produced, it is by no means clear that the palm of superiority could be awarded to the Greek poet; for in Florence, as well as in Athens, many prominent men found themselves exposed to the ridicule and scorn of their fellow-citizens. It seems, however, that the comedy of Machiavelli which produced most effect in this way has never been published. We are told that so many felt deeply hurt by it, that the author was induced to destroy the manuscript; but it is proper to add that this is somewhat inconsistent with the account that the Cardinal de Medici was so well pleased with the piece, that, after he was elected Pope, (Leo X.,) he caused even the decorations of the theatre and the dresses of the actors as well as the actors themselves to be transported to Rome, in order that he might see at his own court a representation that had afforded him so much delight at Florence.*

But the most famous of all Machiavelli's works is *Il Principe*. It is this which has led so many eminent and illustrious men to exert their talents and their influence to affix the stigma of infamy to his name. Nor have they done so in vain; for they have succeeded in convincing at least half the world—probably two-thirds of the most intelligent—that he

* After alluding to the success of the *Mandragola*, and reminding us that it has been imitatedby Rousseau, M. Laharpe adds: "Toute imparfaite qu'est pour *nous* cette piece, elle donna le premiere idée de l'intrigue et du dialogue comique, comme la *Sophonisbe* du Trissin fut la premiere tragédie composée d'après les regles d'Aristote.—*Cours de Litterature*, tome iv., p. 52.

ns no better than a monster. We have already remarked
general terms that there is but too much in the work un-
r consideration which seems to justify the worst charge
ade against the author, namely, that of his being an abet-
r of the most atrocious crimes which even tyrants can be
ilty of. We now proceed to give some extracts from the
rk, so that the reader may be able to judge for himself as
the motives and meaning of the author. "For my part,"
ays, in dedicating the work to Lorenzo de Medici, "my
xiety to present myself to the notice of your highness with
e best proof of my devotion has not enabled me to discover
ongst all I possess, anything that I esteem more, or ac-
unt so valuable, as a knowledge of the actions of celebrated
n—a knowledge acquired by a long experience of modern
ns and a diligent perusal of the ancients." The substance
this knowledge and experience is, that a prince should leave
obstacle in his way in his efforts to maintain his power;
must shrink from nothing, however horrible or atrocious, in
rying out his ideas, whether his object be to conquer ano-
r people, or to hold in subjugation those over whom he
as. In showing "why the kingdom of Darius, conquered
Alexander, remained with his successors after his death,"
says: "Thus, whoever attacks the Turks should expect to
d them united, and must depend more on his own strength
an on their division. But once vanquished and their armies
solutely put to rout, nothing more is to be feared, *except the
mily of the prince. That one extinct*, all further apprehension
at an end, since no one else will have interest among the
ople."* Here it is plainly intimated to the conqueror, that
he wishes to maintain his conquest, he must not hesitate to
e that the whole family of the prince whom he has despoiled
extinct.

He shows that in seizing on a country like France,
e prince must expect to encounter more difficulties; "Here
e may easily secure an entrance by gaining over (bribing)
rtain nobles of the kingdom, among whom there will always
e a party discontented and fond of change."† The country
y be conquered in this way; but there will be so many to
stroy that some must escape, and therefore it may be better
on the whole not to attempt the conquest of a nation like
ance. "Nor will it be sufficient in this case," says Machi-
lli, "*to destroy the family of the prince*; there still remain the

* Chap. iv. † Ib.

nobles of the kingdom to take the lead of new parties, an those can neither be satisfied nor destroyed, the conquest be lost, &c."* That is, if both the nobles and the famil the dethroned prince could be conveniently massacred would be all very well; but since this cannot be done, i best to try nations that are differently constituted.

In Chapter V., princes are told how cities and princi ties should be governed, which before they were subd lived under their own laws. "There are three ways," says, "of maintaining them. *The first is to ruin them;* second to inhabit them; the third is to leave them in th joyment of their laws, rendering them tributary, and es lishing there a small council to form a government, w may keep their country in peace," &c. He not only g the first place to the method of destruction, but he proc to give reasons why it is, upon the whole, the surest. " Lacedæmonians," he says, "and the Romans furnish us examples of these different ways of retaining a state. first governed Athens by founding there a government com ed of a few persons; nevertheless *they afterwards lost the* This shows that the Lacedæmonians did not pursue the r course; their mistake was that they did not strangle, son, or crucify the principal inhabitants, instead of ing to humor them with even the shadow of a local gov ment! Lest any prince might be so stupid as not to derstand this, the author adds: "The Romans, to make of Capua, Carthage, and Numantia, *destroyed them and dis lose them.*" Even this is not deemed sufficiently exp The author would have his readers understand, that w the Romans pursued a less energetic course they faile their attempt. "They were," he says, "on the contrary sirous to hold Greece in the same manner the Spartans done, by *restoring its liberty and its laws;* this mode *did however, succeed*, and they were *compelled* at last to *destroy so cities* of Greece in order to retain their country; and do less *that was the safest way*, for otherwise, whoever beco master of a free state, and *does not destroy it*, may expect t *ruined by it himself.*"‡ Thus, according to Machiavelli, much better that several populous cities and their inh tants should be destroyed than that one prince shoul "ruined!" In the opinion of Machiavelli, it is not h that there will be much trouble with a people who

* Chap. iv. † Ib. ‡ Ib.

been in the habit of living under a prince, after the family of that prince has become extinct. In this case all it is necessary to make away with is the royal family; but this must be effectually done. Neither male nor female, youth nor age, must be spared! It is different, however, in states accustomed to freedom. "In republics, on the contrary," says Machiavelli, "the resentment of citizens is stronger and more active, the desire of vengeance more animated, and the remembrance of their ancient liberty will not permit them to enjoy a single instant of repose, so that the surest means is either to destroy them, or to live among them (*talchè la piu sicura via è epignerle e abitarvi*). Thus, in the case of republics, he gives the preference to the plan of destruction.

It seems difficult to believe that any one who has ever had a friend or relative, or who was capable of any human feeling, could calmly and deliberately give expression to such sentiments; yet such is the animus of the *Prince* from beginning to end. If he had made such remarks as we have quoted, only in one chapter, or two or three, it might be said that he was in an unhappy frame of mind when he made them; but he recurs to the same ideas again and again, and presents them in every form. In one place, he plainly recommends the method of destruction as the best; in another, he shows how the ancients had availed themselves of it; in another, he gives happy examples of its practice among the moderns, &c. Thus, in speaking, in Chapter VII., "of new principalities acquired by foreign aid or good fortune," he has great admiration to bestow on Cæsar Borgia, because, although he was not successful in maintaining his power, he allowed no scruple to prevent him from putting all in his power out of the way who were likely to restrain his ambition. "If, therefore," he says, "we examine the whole conduct of Borgia, we shall see how fine a foundation he laid for future greatness. This examination will not be superfluous; for I know *no better lesson for the instruction of a prince* than is afforded by the *actions* and *example* of the duke; for if the measures he adopted did not succeed, it was not his fault, but rather *owing to the perversity of fortune*."

Had this remark been made by one who was not acquainted with the character of Borgia, or who was not aware of his atrocities, it would not have been strange, as all cannot know what is the conduct of those whom they meet daily in the ordinary intercourse of life. But no one knew "the duke" better than Machiavelli, or perhaps, as well. This, indeed, he proves

to us himself, as we shall presently see. Passing over admiring account given of Borgia's general plans for ele ing himself by the ruin of others, we come to where Mac velli tells us that "the duke determined therefore neithe depend on fortune, nor on the arms of another prince. began by weakening the party of the Orsini and Colonn Rome, by corrupting all the persons of distinction who hered to them, either by bribes, appointments, or comm suited to their respective qualities, so that in a few mo a complete revolution was effected in their attachment, they all came over to the duke." This is the mildest of Borgia's conduct, as described by Machiavelli. "Havi he continues, "thus humbled the Colonni, he only waite opportunity *for destroying the Orsini*. It was not long be one offered, of which *he did not fail to avail himself*."

The author gives no details in the *Prince* of the manne which this was done; he confines himself to an observatio two which, however, are significant enough. "His (Borg affairs once re-established, he grew weary of relying on Fr and other foreign allies, and he resolved to rely alone *on fice and dissimulation*—a course in which he so well succe that the Orsini were reconciled to him through the in vention of Signor Paola, whom he had gained over to interests by all manner of rich presents and friendly off And this man, being deceived himself, so far prevailed on credulity of the rest that they attended the duke at an in view at Signigalia, *where they were all put to death*." T several members of the best families in Italy are invited friendly interview; they, suspecting no deception, but lieving that the duke really meant what he said, meet as directed. He has troops in readiness to seize upon t at the proper moment, and they are seized accordingly murdered in cold blood; and this is what Machiavelli gra calls exemplary conduct for a prince! In the same cha (vii.) a little further on, he tells how Borgia had appointed mino d'Orco as governor, "a cruel but active man, to wh he gave the greatest latitude of power. He very soon peased the disturbances, united all parties, and acquired renown of restoring the whole country to peace." what does the exemplary duke do then? Let Machia tell in his own words: "He was aware that the sever of Ramino had excited some hatred against him, and re ed, therefore, to clear himself *from all reproach in minds of the people*, and to gain their affection, by sh

ing them that the cruelties which had been committed did not originate with him, but *solely* in the ferocious disposition of his minister. Taking advantage, therefore, of the discontents, he caused Ramino to be massacred one morning in the market place, and his body exposed upon a gibbet with a cutlass near it stained with blood."

Thus, he instructs his governor to murder every man that has the power, and probably the disposition, to thwart his designs, and then he causes the governor to be dealt with after the same fashion. After relating rather a sickening variety of "incidents" of this kind, Machiavelli observes: "Upon a thorough review, therefore, of the duke's *conduct and actions*, I cannot reproach him with having omitted any precaution, and I *feel that he merits being proposed as a model to all* who by fortune or foreign arms succeed in acquiring sovereignty." As there is no rule without an exception, even Cæsar Borgia erred in one thing, that is, in not preventing the election of Julius II. to the pontificate. Why should he have prevented him? "He could not," says Machiavelli, "nominate the prelate whom he wished, but he had it in his power to exclude any one whom he disliked. He ought, therefore, never to have consented to the election of one of those cardinals whom he had formerly injured, and who might have reason to fear him after his election, for mankind injure others from motives either of hatred or fear." That is, because he wronged the cardinal once, he ought to do so whenever an opportunity offered. The way it was, the cardinal being shocked by his atrocities, did not hesitate to say so; this was an unpardonable offence. But the other cardinals who were candidates for the pontificate had denounced Borgia in a similar manner, with the exceptions of the Cardinal de Rouen and the Spanish cardinals, who probably did not know him as well as their brethren. Machiavelli, in commenting on this, says: "The duke, therefore, ought by all means to have procured the election of a Spaniard, or in case of failure, should have consented to the proposal of the Archbishop of Rouen, but on no account to the nomination of St. Peter and Vincula." The simple meaning of this is, that he should not have consented to invest any one with power who knew him to be a bad man, and had the honesty and manliness to oppose him as such. Nor was it at all necessary to instruct Cæsar Borgia in this doctrine; he acted upon it without instruction to the utmost of his power, and he failed only because, when his influence came to be tested, it proved by no means such as his admirer represents it.

Lest it might be supposed by the more timid class of princes that inasmuch as Cæsar Borgia was not successful in his plans, notwithstanding the exemplary manner in which he murdered all who opposed him, Machiavelli shows in Chapter VIII. that in general very different results spring from such a course when resolutely carried out—a fact which affords additional evidence, that, had Borgia only ventured a little further in the practice of his favorite theory, it was more than probable that his laudable efforts would have been crowned with success. "Agathocles" he says, "a Sicilian, an individual of the lowest class, raised himself to the throne of Syracuse. He was the son of a potter of dissolute and wicked habits, but he conducted himself with infinite ability," &c. By this means he became prætor of Syracuse, and resolved to make himself sovereign. "Having well weighed his purpose, he held a communication with Hamilcar, who had then command of the Carthaginian army in Sicily. Agathocles one morning assembled the people and the senate of Syracuse, under the pretext of deliberating on public affairs. At a given signal he caused all the senators and the richest of the inhabitants to be massacred by the soldiery; after whose death he assumed the sovereignty and enjoyed it without obstruction or molestation."

This, of course, is very encouraging. He also shows how Oliverotto evinced similar resolution and courage. "He put to death all the discontented who had the power to injure him; he established new laws, both civil and military; and in the space of one year he had so effectually consolidated his power that he was not only firmly established in the sovereignty of Fermo, but had rendered himself formidable to all his neighbors," &c. All this shows, according to Machiavelli, that in order to succeed in securing and maintaining power, the main point is to put as many of the discontented out of the way as possible, and do so at once; there must be no instalments in work of so important a character. "Whence I conclude," he says, "that the usurper of a state *should commit all the cruelties* which his safety renders necessary at once, that he may never have cause to repeat them; by not renewing them, *he will acquire the loyalty of his new subjects*," &c. That is, they will be so grateful because they have not been slaughtered themselves like their fellow-citizens, that he may calculate on their loyalty! The best writers on the science of government tell us that the system which makes the nearest approach

to the government of the family is the best; but what would be said of the father who would murder every member of his family, whom he regarded as at all likely to oppose his plans; would the surviving members be more affectionate to him than they would have been had he murdered none, because they had been allowed to escape? In our opinion, there is much more atrocity than philosophy after all in most of the precepts of Machiavelli. But we are not entirely done with *Il Principe* yet We have to notice other precepts still more odious and revolting, if possible, than those already glanced at.

In Chapter XVII., he answers, in his peculiar way, the question as to whether cruelty is better than clemency, and whether it is better to be loved than feared. Here, too, he brings forward his favorite model. "Cæsar Borgia," he says, "was accounted cruel; but it was to that cruelty that he was indebted for the advantage of uniting Romagna to his other dominions." According to Machiavelli, it matters not what are the means adopted, provided the results are favorable to him who adopts them.* In regard to being loved or feared, Machiavelli thinks that "if it is necessary to make a resolution, it is safer to be feared than loved. For it may be truly affirmed of mankind in general, that they are ungrateful, fickle, timid, dissembling, and self-interested; so long as you can serve them they are entirely devoted to you," &c. The author continues to explain how much better it is for a prince "rather to rely on his own resources (that is, his executioners) than on the caprice of others."

In Chapter XVIII. he discusses the question "whether princes ought to be faithful to their engagements;"

---

* It is a singular fact, that, although none have more earnestly or more ably combated this mischievous doctrine than the Jesuits, it is they themselves who get the credit, or rather the discredit, of maintaining it. That is, by refuting Machiavelli better than any others they have led many to believe that they themselves are advocates of the same precepts. True it is only those who have not read them, or who have been incapable of understanding their arguments—those who get their opinions at second-hand—that have come to any such conclusion; but unfortunately for the cause of truth and justice, this class is always the most numerous, even in the most intelligent communities. The Jesuits need not despair, however; it is no worse to compare them to Machiavelli, revolting as his precepts are, than it was to compare them to his Infernal Majesty, as they were when their superior knowledge of chemistry enabled them to declare the substance now known as Peruvian bark a valuable remedy for various diseases. For nearly a century this was excluded from the *materia medica* of all orthodox Protestants, under the name of Jesuits' bark, on the ground that it must have been an invention of Satan, and that its object was to destroy the light of the Gospel, and bring all who used it back to popery!

but, as might well be expected, the conclusion he arrives at is, that they should not be faithful to any engagement which is not to their own interest. Thus he explains as follows: "Now, as a prince *must learn how to act the part of a beast* sometimes, he should make the fox and the lion his pattern. The first can but feebly defend himself against the wolf, and the latter readily falls into such snares as are laid for him. From the fox, therefore, a prince will learn dexterity in avoiding snares, and from the lion, how to employ his strength in keeping the wolves in awe. But they who entirely rely upon the lion's strength, will not always meet with success; in other words, a prudent prince *cannot and ought not to keep his word, except he can do it without injury to himself*," &c. The simple and obvious meaning of this is, that it is right for a prince to lie as well as to assassinate when it suits his purpose to do so. If the people and the army happen to be opposed to each other, Machiavelli would have his prince be cautious, lest he might happen to favor the weak side, which would be a grievous error. It may seem incredible that even Machiavelli would lay down such a precept; but the fact is not the less true.

Speaking of the conduct of different Roman emperors, he tells us that "most of them, indeed particularly those who were advanced to the throne from a private condition, despairing to reconcile interests totally opposite, determined to take part with the troops, and trouble themselves but little about the discontents of the people; and *this conduct was the safest*; for in the alternative of exciting the greater or lesser number, it is better to take part with the strongest side."* None of the precepts of Machiavelli have been more readily adopted than that which recommends being on the strong side; nor do we remember any that have been more recently acted upon. In the late war with Denmark, for example, one of the greatest powers of Europe joined the strong side, whereas no power joined the weak side, but calmly looked on until it was overpowered. But Machiavelli does not confine himself, in Chapter XIX., to recommending that the weak rather than the strong be aided; he also undertakes to show that it is a weakness to shrink from doing evil and do good in its stead. "We may

* Il partito era necessario; perchè non potendo i Principi mancare di non essere odiati da qualcuno, si debbono prima sforzare di non essere odiati da università; e quando non possono consequir questo, si debbono ingegnare con ogni industria fuggire, l'odio di quelee università che sono più potenti. *Il Principe*, cap. xix.

t here," he says, "that hatred is as easily incurred by
ictions as by evil; and hence, as I have said before, a
is often compelled to be wicked in order to maintain
ver." Who then would do good? This would be the
l inference were we to assent to the premises. But
ilosopher continues: "For when the strongest party
rupt (whether it be the people, the nobles, or the
he must comply with their disposition and con-
iem, and from that moment *he must renounce doing good, ill prove his ruin.*

think we have now furnished our readers suffi-
pecimens of Machiavelli's precepts to enable them to
tolerably accurate idea of his motives and intentions in
the *Prince.* At the beginning of our article we
ll that occurred to us as in the author's favor, our ob-
ing, not to prove that Machiavelli was guilty of all
s been laid to his charge, nor yet that he was inno-
ut to make as close an approximation as possible to the

We have already intimated that although the gene-
dict of several generations of thinkers has been adverse
hiavelli,* a considerable number of eminent men have
aken his defence. The first who condemned the work,
nselling oppression in its most cruel and revolting
was Ambrosio Catarino, Archbishop of Consa, who
the attention of the Pope to it as one whose circula-
ould be prohibited; and it was prohibited accordingly.
e first who wrote an elaborate refutation of its princi-
as the celebrated Cardinal Pole, who assailed it with
rehemence, and with considerable effect. Soon after,
e dissertation was written on it, with thesame object,
hop Caterino Politi. Nor have Protestants been less
than Catholics in denouncing the work as an outrage
manity. One of the best dissertations extant on the
t is the *Refutation* of Innocent Gentiletto, a French
tant. No one admired Machiavelli's "Treatise on the
War," or his "History of Florence," more than Frede-
e Great; but this did not prevent the latter from wri-
n able and earnest dissertation in refutation of the
. This attracted so much attention in the East as well
he West, that Mustapha III. caused it to be translated
'ersian, together with the treatise which it criticised.

---

y a bien peu d'auteurs," says Bayle, "qui parlent de lui sans donner
diction à sa mémoire."

But the most complete refutation of all is that of Fa Lucchesini, an Italian Jesuit, in his work entitled *Sag della Sciocchezza di Niccolo Machiavelli*, which was publis at Rome in 1697.

Among those who have eloquently defended Machiav are Boccalen, Mascardi, Scioppius, Conringius, and M. Amel all of whom maintain that those who have condemned M chiavelli have either not read him, or been too ignor to understand him.* Nor have there been wanting Engl writers to attempt the vindication of the great Florenti It is hardly strange that Macaulay has done so. T champion of William III. would hardly be consistent w himself if he found any serious fault with the maxim Machiavelli, since it is doubtful whether any other prince acted on those maxims more ruthlessly than the hero of Gl coe; for what worse has even Machiavelli himself recommen than that treacherous, base, and revolting massacre? In seve chapters of his famous book he advises the prince to r those he conquers, or from whom he has any danger to app hend. That William III. took his advice in this is well kno to all acquainted with the history of Ireland, not to m tion that of Scotland. Had he done nothing more to ruin Irish, than to maintain a large fleet as he did on the coast Ireland, the chief if not the sole duty of which was to se as a pirate every vessel attempting to trade with that count would it not have been sufficient to prove him a wort disciple of Machiavelli? If we bear these facts in mind, shall be the better able to comprehend the champion of "g glorious, pious, and immortal memory." The terms in wh Machiavelli has been commonly described since this wo has been given to the world, "would seem," says Macaul "to impart that he was the tempter, the evil principle, t discoverer of ambition and revenge, the original inventor perjury, and that, before the publication of his fatal 'Prin there had never been a hypocrite, a tyrant, or a traitor, simulated virtue, or a convenient crime. One writer grav assures us that Maurice of Saxony learned all his fraudul policy from that execrable volume. Another remarks th since it was transcribed into Turkish, the sultans have be more addicted than formerly to the custom of strangli their brothers. Lord Lyttleton charges the poor Florenti

* "De tous ceux qui censurent Machiavel," says Amelot, "vous trouv que les uns avouent qu'ils ne l'ont pas jamais lû et que les autres qui di l'avoir lû ne l'ont jamais entendu," &c.

the manifold treasons of the house of Guise, and with
massacre of St. Bartholomew. Several authors have
l that the Gunpowder Plot is to be primarily attributed
doctrines, and seem to think that his effigy ought to
tituted for that of Guy Fawkes, in those processions
hich the ingenious youth of England annually com-
rate the preservation of the three estates. The
1 of Rome has pronounced his works accursed
. Nor have our countrymen been backward in
ing their opinion of his merits. Out of his
ne they have coined an epithet for a knave, and out of
ristian name a synonyme for the devil.* It is, indeed,
ly possible for any person, not well acquainted with
story and literature of Italy, to read without horror
nazement the celebrated treatise which has brought so
obloquy on the name of Machiavelli. Such a display
kedness, naked, yet not ashamed—such cool, judicious,
fic atrocity, seemed rather to belong to a fiend than to
ost depraved of men. Principles which the most hard-
ruffian would scarcely hint to his most trusted accom-
or avow, without the disguise of some palliating
m, even to his own mind, are professed without the
st circumlocution, and assumed as the fundamental
s of all political science. It is not strange that *ordi-
readers* should regard the author of such a book as the
lepraved and shameless of human beings. Wise men,
er, have always been inclined to look with suspicion
e angels and demons of the multitude; and, in the
st instance, several circumstances have led even super-
observers to *question the justice of the vulgar decision*. It
orious that Machiavelli was through life a zealous
lican. In the same year in which he composed his
al of king-craft, he suffered imprisonment and torture
cause of public liberty. It seems inconceivable that
artyr of freedom should have designedly acted as the
e of tyranny. Several eminent writers have, therefore,
vored to detect in this *unfortunate performance* some
ded meaning, more consistent with the character and
ct of the author than that which appears at first
."†

---

* Nick Machiavel had ne'er a trick,
Tho' he gave his name to our Old Nick.
—*Hudibras*, part iii., canto i.

tical and Historical Essays, vol. i.

We have already shown that it is not "ordinary readers," or the "vulgar," as Macaulay says, that have condemned Machiavelli, but some of the most illustrious men that Europe has produced, and men who have differed on almost all other subjects. Protestant and Catholic, the follower of Mahomet, and he who has no faith in any religion, have combined in denouncing the maxims of Machiavelli as the worst ever promulgated. We have alluded to several prelates Catholic and Protestant, who have denounced the *Prince* as a bad book. There is scarcely one even of those philosophers known as infidels who has not done the same. "A strange man this Machiavel!" says Voltaire. "He amuses himself with making verses, writing plays, showing his cabinet the art of killing with regularity, and *teaching princes the art of perjuring themselves, assassinating, and poisoning as occasion required.*"* Further on the same writer remarks, that "in all Machiavelli's works there is not one word which renders virtue amiable—not one word proceeding from the heart." Bayle is equally decided in condemning Machiavelli. He quotes the best arguments adduced in his favor by his apologists, but he denies that they exculpate him.† Probably these are "vulgar" according to Macaulay; although it is very doubtful whether he has ever read either. He has certainly not read the Latin books written in refutation of Machiavelli. Another thinker, who can hardly be said to belong to the vulgar, is Frederick Schlegel. "But how," asks the learned and eloquent writer, "are we to justify, or even familiarly to illustrate, the doctrines of that state policy which he was *at such pains to propagate*, and which met with a success but too complete. The ideal standard of a ruthless tyrant, which he sets up, as it were, for the instruction of sovereign rulers, has been *sought* to be palliated on the plea of his intention to depict in graphic coloring the political degradation of his age and country."‡ But Schlegel does not take leave of his subject in such easy terms as these. After fully acknowledging the splendid abilities of the man, Schlegel proceeds: "The most startling peculiarity in Machiavelli remains to be considered; it does not consist in the axiom so often quoted and refuted, that the end justifies the

* Phil. Dict., art. Battalion.

† Cela ne disculpe point Machiavel; il advance des maximes qu'il ne blâme pas; mais un bon historien qui raporte la pratique de ces maximes la condamne.—*Dict. de Bayle, art. Machiavelli.*

‡ Schlegel's History of Literature, Lect. IX.

s, but rather in his endeavors to institute a political sys-
in the heart of modern Christian Europe of such
port and general spirit as totally to ignore Chris-
y, nay, *the very existence of God* and retributive justice;
h this Christianity had hitherto been commonly regarded
hallowing medium of brotherhood, the bond of union
the several states of Europe. The recognised right of
igns to rule over their subjects was in proportion to
bedience to the will of God. On this supposition alone
upremacy was indicated. All principalities, jurisdic-
and rights were still based on the invisible ground-work
Church. Now of all this state economy Machiavelli
not the slightest notice; not only does he write in the
pirit of paganism, but he *thinks* so likewise, and in the
mphatic manner. Just as the power of ancient Rome
unded, in the main, on violence and fraud, and justice
egarded as superfluous, or an ornament of no intrin-
ue; so Machiavelli regards force and intelligence as
ost potent levers of state machinery. The idea of jus-
altogether left out of the question."* Schlegel
des his estimate of the Machiavellian policy by the re-
that it "*undeniably had a disastrous and pernicious influ-
succeeding generations.*"

ch are the opinions of the most eminent critics whom
n Europe has produced; and we might add those of
squieu, Fénélon, Sismondi, and Bacon. If these can be
belong to "the multitude," or "the vulgar," then Lord
lay may be right; but the truth is, that it is the vulgar—
incapable of estimating the remote results of causes—
ave declared the *Prince* a harmless book, except in those
es in which they had a hero to vindicate like him of
be. That Macaulay is an eloquent and attractive
far be it from us to deny; but he is as unreliable as
avelli himself. The historian who would make a model
of William III., and make a swindler and hypocrite of
m Penn, may well be compared to the author of the
Castrucio Castracami, which is much more like a
ce than a veritable history. But at the same time,
take the most favorable view possible of Machiavelli's
s work; let us give him the benefit of every fact or
stance that seems to imply any doubt of his guilt. It
appear that he did not intend that the *Prince* should

* Schlegel's History of Literature, Lect. IX.

be published; that he only wrote it for the Medici fam and that his great object in doing so was to get employ from them, for he was miserably poor at the time. T indeed, is no justification; but still it may be received a extenuation, since the most upright minds have not alw been found proof against the stings of poverty. It is sai him, that when reproached for the maxims of the *Princ* replied: "If I taught princes how to tyrannize, I also ta the people how to destroy them." His defenders place m stress on this remark, and pretend to regard it as the s of his treatise; but those who carefully examine the b cannot accept any such excuse. Apart from the ton which the whole work is written, and the plain, unmist ble lessons which it teaches, there are passages in it w prove clearly that it was by no means intended for pop perusal. As an instance we need only refer to the ope of the fifteenth chapter; he observes, "But as I write for those who possess a sound judgment, I thought it be to treat this subject as it really is," &c. Had any of works been published during his lifetime, he might have reason to apprehend that the people, as well as their ru would be made aware of his sentiments, but none were.

There is, however, one claim which the apologist Machiavelli make, which ought not to be denied, nam that we should overlook many of his faults because he the first who discovered the secret of what is now kn as comparative, or philosophical history. All unprejud writers admit that his Discourses on Livy* may be rega as the foundation of philosophical history; nor can i denied that his History of Florence, whatever may b faults in regard to matters of fact in which his patrons interested, is eminently philosophical. This great work enough," says Hallam," to immortalize the name of Machia Seldom has a more giant stride been made in any depart of literature than by this judicious, clear, and ele history."

We are also asked to remember that all the p cipal historians of Italy have a tendency to represent hu nature in its darkest features, and that when their pathies are strongly excited against those they denou they delineate monsters rather than men. So well are aware of this themselves, that scarcely any of them ve

* *De Discordi sopra la prima deca.*

to publish their works during their lifetime. Even Guicciardini did not do so; nor did his nephew dare to publish them until twenty years after his death. All he could publish then were the first sixteen books; and these were by no means complete in themselves. In short, it was not until 1775, more than two centuries after his history was written, that it was allowed to be published complete in Italy. Philip Nerli may be alluded to as another instance. We are told that he presented the manuscript of his *Commentarj dé Fatti Civili* to his nephew with his dying hand; that the latter presented them to the Grand Duke of Florence for publication, but that the work was not permitted to appear until one hundred and fifty years after the death of the author. Several other instances might be added; but all show not that the historians so treated caricature or misrepresent, but that, like their illustrious predecessors Livy and Tacitus, especially the latter, they have the manliness and courage to denounce the evil-doers, no matter how high they are in power, or how great is their influence. This was the case, for instance, with Bernardo Signi, author of another history of Florence, who concludes his work as follows: "My design has but one end, that our posterity may learn by those notices the root of the causes of so many troubles which we have suffered, while they expose the malignity of those men who have raised them up, or prolonged them; as well as the goodness of those who did all which they could to turn them away." But we refer to these much more to show that there are no historians more fearless than the Italian historians, than with any view of showing that their conduct affords any justification, nay any excuse for the precepts of Machiavelli. There can be no weaker argument than that which seeks to make an author's country or countrymen responsible for his want of principle; but when applied to the historians of Italy, who are admitted by all competent judges to be unsurpassed if equalled by those of any other country, it becomes too puerile for serious notice.

We would not be understood, however, as asserting that there is nothing true or just in *Il Principe*. On the contrary, it contains some maxims the truth of which has been proved by the experience of ages; although it must be confessed that these are like angels' visits. Indeed, there are so few of them, that they can hardly be said to relieve the repulsive character of the work as a whole. Yet, as our wish is to give even Satan his due, we will note two or three of Ma-

chiavelli's maxims, which are somewhat applicable at the
sent day. Like most others who have written anythin
the science of war, he regarded a ruler who could not
in time of need as an anomaly. "A prince," he says, "
is ignorant of the art of war can never enjoy repose or s
amongst armed subjects; he will always be to them an
ject of contempt, as they to him will justly be subject
suspicion; how is it possible, then, that they should ac
concert? In short, a prince who does not understand
art of war *can never be esteemed* by his troops, nor can he
confide in them."* We have shown on former occasions th
milar views were entertained by Grotius, Montesquieu, Va
and others, and that they were quite as applicable to
sidents of republics as to princes—to all, without distinct
who undertake the duties of a ruler. By this we meant
thing unfriendly to any one; but, on the contrary, our ob
was to make suggestions to those whom they might conc
the force of which is founded in human nature.

In Chapter XIX. of the *Prince* there are other ma
the truth of which cannot be denied; such, for exampl
the following: "A prince whose conduct is *light*, in
stant, pusillanimous, irresolute, and *effeminate*, is sure to
despised; these defects he ought to shun as he woul
many rocks, and endeavor to display a character for *cou
gravity, energy*, and magnificence in all his actions."
only comment necessary to make on this is, that Machia
is by no means peculiar in the opinion, that, let rulers
themselves what name they may, they ought to em
jokers and buffoons if they have a taste for that sor
thing, but not make jokers or buffoons of themselves, s
in doing the latter they not only bring contempt on th
selves, but also bring discredit on the nation whose l
they happen to be, though only for a season.

Machiavelli is equally supported by experience
the hints which he gives to teach rulers how to secure
teem. "Princes ought," he says, "to honor talents and
tect the arts." Can it be said that presidents ought to
sue a different course? This may seem an absurd ques
yet, were we to judge by the facts, we should seem boun
answer it in the affirmative. Nor does Machiavelli ne
to instruct his prince in the art of choosing a ministry-
art which is of much more importance than many woul

* Chap. xiv.

willing to admit. "In the capacities of mankind," he says, "there are three degrees: one man understands things by means of his own natural endowments, another understands things when they are explained to him, and a third *can neither understand them of himself nor when they are explained.* The first are rare and excellent, the second have their merit, but the last are wholly worthless."* And, we ask, does it not sometimes happen that the ruler himself is the only member of the government to which he belongs that "understands things by means of his own natural endowments?" We say, is there not an instance of this kind at the present day on the American continent? But Machiavelli asks the very pertinent question, "How are princes to know their ministers?" There is one infallible rule, viz., to observe whether he attends more to *his own interest than to that of the state.*" † That is to say, if he be a person who engages in other business, such as distilling bad liquor, trying to put himself in the prince's place, furnishing almanac manufacturers with false predictions, squandering the public money in printing volumes of long, rigmarole letters which nobody will read, &c., &c., then he is not fit to be a minister; and who will deny that it is a pretty correct view of the case?

We have now presented both sides of the question to our readers as to an intelligent jury, with every disposition to do justice to one who, whatever were his faults, was undoubtedly one of the most highly gifted men of the age in which he lived. We have, indeed, omitted many facts and circumstances which no doubt would shed much additional light on the subject; but this was inevitable. No one could expect us to compress within the limits of an article what would require an octavo volume. All we intended was to give the main facts *pro* and *con.*, compare them with each other, and see whether they were more reconcilable, upon the whole, with the theory of Machiavelli's innocence than with that of his guilt. In the short time we have been able to devote to the subject, we have done this to the best of our ability, and, while it would afford us infinitely more pleasure to acquit than condemn so powerful and vigorous an intellect, we cannot agree in any of the various interpretations of the *Prince* which would justify its revolting maxims.

* Chap. xxiii. † *Ib.*

ART. VII. *Prospectuses and Pamphlets of various Petroleum Companies, New York and Philadelphia.* 1865.

THERE are many things that are useful and valuable in themselves which are made the means, or rather the pretext, of ruining thousands. Petroleum is destined to prove one of these; and accordingly we would warn the public not to be too credulous. That the article is a great source of wealth, and that fortunes will be made by it, far be it from us to deny. But, like every other commodity involving labor and expense, it requires capital to render it available. It is not every half dozen or dozen of persons who combine together and call themselves a company that can command a million, a half-million, or even one-tenth of a million of money, let them proclaim what they may to the contrary. Some can, no doubt, and do. All understand this; but the difficulty is to distinguish the genuine from the spurious. It often happens that the latter make a much greater display than the former, the same as the worst fire produces the most smoke. The terms they offer, too, are frequently better—that is, better in appearance; they offer higher interest, a larger dividend, or larger profits, as the case may be; but it is better in reality to offer five, four, nay, one per cent. and pay it when it becomes due, than to offer ten or even fifty per cent. and pay nothing. The speculators understand this, and accordingly they sometimes use low figures so that they may be able to say "We do not make you as large offers or extravagant promises as others, because what we say we will do in any event; we prefer to surprise our stockholders by giving them more at the close of the year than we promised, rather than by giving them less." This sort of logic has its effect on a large number who find when it is too late that neither fine promises nor a great display of hundreds of thousands in the form of printed figures are to be relied upon.

The only safe plan under existing circumstances, that is, while certain of our laws continue so imperfect as they are, is to institute some inquiries in regard to the character, business standing, and resources of the principal members of the company in whose stock one has an idea of making an investment. To find that they are proof against this test when it has been intelligently applied is of greater importance as an inducement to invest than any amount of rhetoric or figures. Men, distinguished for their integrity in other

branches of business, or who are known to have acquitted themselves honorably of their duties as public men, are not likely to engage in a spurious enterprise, or to receive the money of their fellow-citizens under false pretences, and therefore those disposed to try their fortune in that way should choose those companies to which such men belong.

That this discrimination is necessary will be readily admitted by all who have paid any attention to the history of commercial speculations in different parts of the world. Be it remembered that there is scarcely a country in Europe in which the most stringent laws have not been passed against such for the purpose of protecting the numerous class to which is applied the adage, "A fool and his money soon part." As an example, it will be sufficient for us to refer to England, whose statute-books contain a considerable proportion of such enactments. The latter show that during the years 1718, 1719, and 1720 an incredible number of persons of more than ordinary intelligence suffered themselves to be reduced to poverty by the "bubbles" of the day, as such speculations were then called. A writer of the time tells us that "the pretended design of those undertakings was to raise a stock, setting on foot, or carrying on some promising or useful branch of trade, manufacture, machinery, or the like. In order to which, proposals were given out showing the advantages of the design, and inviting persons into it. The sum necessary to carry on the affair, together with the profits arising from it, were divided into a certain number of shares or subscriptions, to be purchased by persons disposed to adventure therein. The real design in some was to raise a sum for the private advantage of the proprietors, to be laid out by them in the South Sea stock, &c., in hopes by the rise thereof to be able to refund the subscribers' money with profit to themselves. In others, the design was absolutely *to defraud the adventurers of their subscription money without any view to restitution*," &c.

Various attempts were made by government to put an end to a system which was so prolific in evil to those who were at once avaricious and silly—of whom there is always a large number in every country that pays much attention to commerce. An act was passed in the sixth year of the reign of George I. which subjected all unwarrantable undertakings by unlawful subscriptions to the penalties of *præmunire*, but the mania for money-making was so great that it failed to produce the desired effect. A proclamation

was next tried (1720), but that also failed to suppress t system. We are told that at length, in the same year, wri of *scire facias* were issued against several companies by nam and in general against all other projects promulgated co trary to law ; and the crown lawyers were strictly enjoin to prosecute all such as had opened books of subscriptio and all who subscribed to them, or who made or accept any transfer in them. The publication of the *scire fac* by authority in the *Gazette* struck so general a pan amongst the conductors of all these bubbles, that the su denness of their fall was not less astonishing than th extent and magnitude.* The *scire facias*, prosecuted strict as it was, proved so effectual that no such mania has ev since sprung up in England.

" But Petroleum is a new thing," many will answer. N so, however. Far from its being a new thing, there is nothi of which history gives us an earlier account. The traces it are to be found to this day in the ruins of Babylon a Nineveh, in both of which cities it was used for vario purposes, both for light and fuel, and as one of the princi ingredients in cement, varnish, &c. Among the uses which it was turned by the Egyptians was that of embal ing. The earliest records of Persian history speak of it a familiar and useful substance ; and at the present day it is n only extensively used throughout that country, but is e ported in considerable quantities to all parts of Europe, chief sources being the Peninsula of Apcheron and t shore of the Caspian Sea. In the Burman empire, near Ra anghong there is a large hill containing coal, into which 5 pits have been sunk for the collection of petroleum, whi yield an annual product of 400,000 hogsheads. In sh it is found in one form or other, in greater or less abundan in all parts of the world, generally, but not invariably, in t vicinity of coal mines.

This will be the more easily understood when we see wh are its characteristics. Be it observed that it is but one of t various forms in which bitumen appears. The purest of th forms is *naphtha*, a volatile, limpid liquid, and is genera of a light yellow color and strong, peculiar odor ; but n be rendered colorless and nearly inodorous by careful disti tion. It is very inflammable, and burns with a white fla mixed with smoke. It retains its liquid form at zero (°).

* *History of Commercial Bubbles, Delusions, and Impositions.* By John H Wilkins, of the Middle Temple. London, 1807.

is insoluble in water, but unites in every proportion with petroleum, sulphuric ether, alcohol, and oils in general. The petroleum is much denser than naphtha. The former has a reddish brown color and is unctuous to the touch. It is not always easily distinguished from mineral tar, which has nearly if not all the same properties. . Both are increased in density by exposure to the atmosphere, and there are eminent chemists who are of opinion that if their exposure be sufficiently long both will pass into solid bitumen.

Another variety of bitumen is *asphaltum*. This is a solid substance of a black color, vitreous lustre, and conchoidal fracture. When rubbed it emits a strong bituminous odor, and by distillation yields a fluid which is identical with naphtha. Like the two varieties mentioned, it burns freely and leaves but little residue. It is found in large quantities on the coast of the Dead Sea, and in the island of Trinidad, where it forms a lake three miles in circumference, and of great depth. In more moderate quantities it is to be found throughout the West Indies; nor is it unknown in France, Switzerland, or Germany. A gentle heat renders this variety ductile, and when mixed with a little grease or common pitch it is used by shipwrights as an excellent substitute for the latter article. This is the kind the Babylonians are supposed to have used as a cement for their bricks.

Maltha is also bitumen; it is less fluid than petroleum, but differs from it in no other essential property. It is found in considerable abundance in Puy de la Pége in France, and is used, like petroleum, for various purposes. The French use it extensively as an ingredient in black sealing-wax. What is called *elastic bitumen* is in many respects so much like caoutchouc, or India rubber, that it has obtained the name of *mineral caoutchouc;* but it is very scarce in its native form, none of it being found in Europe save in the south of France and in Derbyshire, England. When taken out of the mine it is highly elastic, but it becomes hard by exposure to the air and loses its elasticity, but retains its bituminous odor.

The best chemists are of opinion that all these varieties are convertible into each other. Thus, naphtha, for example, is but rectified petroleum; and M. Boussingault, who has probably devoted more attention to the subject than any other chemist, informs us, as the result of numerous experiments, that the former when exposed to the atmosphere for a certain time, under certain circumstances, becomes petroleum. This naturally led him to the conclusion that if pe-

troleum were distilled it would afford naphtha, and the results proved that he was right.

From these facts we shall be able to form an approximate estimate of the value of the substance which at present is creating so much excitement. We have no disposition to depreciate this value or deny that it is very great; what we object to is the pretension that it is a new discovery. We take pains to correct this error, because we do not like to see honest, well-meaning people, who wish to be considered intelligent, laughed at for their short-sightedness and credulity. We prefer taking the trouble to inform them that petroleum is used in many parts of the East, and *has been for thousands of years*, for the purposes of both fuel and light. Throughout the empire of Burmah, for example, it is used as lamp oil; and when mixed with common earth or even ashes, it is used by the same people as fuel.

But as a light, naphtha is far superior to petroleum. In its native state, it generally emits too thick a smoke to be pleasant, but when distilled with water in the same manner as the essential oils, the smoke disappears. But the Persians use it in its native state in their finest lamps; they also use it for illuminating their cities as we do coal gas. Nor are the Persians peculiar in rendering it available for the latter purpose. Every intelligent person of an inquiring turn of mind who has visited Italy, or who has carefully read the impressions of those who have done so, is aware that there is a spring of naphtha near the village of Amiano, which yields the substance in sufficient quantity to illuminate the city of Genoa. Yet another property of naphtha is that it is the only known fluid which contains no oxygen. For this reason it is much used by chemists to preserve those new metals discovered by Sir Humphrey Davy. Petroleum has the same property to a considerable extent; in other words it contains but very little oxygen, so that it protects iron from rusting, and is used extensively for that purpose as well as naphtha.

Before we speak of the principal lands in this country in which petroleum has recently been discovered, and which, from the abundance they afford, have been chiefly instrumental in creating the present excitement, we will make some remarks on certain substances which are liable to be mistaken respectively for those we have described, but which are of much less value. Nor is it our object in doing so to gratify mere curiosity; but there are many who have already

been imposed upon by the same resemblance, and discovered their mistake only when it was too late. Coal tar yields by distillation a liquid very similar to mineral naphtha, and which is often sold for it; the same is true of common pitch in comparison with maltha. There is, besides, the substance called naphthaline, which is one of the products of the destructive distillation of coal gas; and which derives its name from its being combined with a species of naphtha in coal tar. On distilling the latter by a gentle heat, the naphtha passes over, and afterwards, by increasing the heat, the less volatile naphthaline rises in vapor and condenses as a white crystalline solid in the neck of the retort. When pure it is heavier than water, has a pungent, aromatic taste, and a peculiar odor, not unlike that of narcissus. Like petroleum, it is smooth and unctuous to the touch, but unlike the latter it is perfectly white when not adulterated. It is not as readily inflamed as petroleum, but when set on fire it burns much more rapidly, producing a considerable quantity of smoke.

We have taken no slight pains to ascertain what are the real grounds of the excitement now existing on the subject of petroleum. First, we directed our researches to the oil lands, making it our business to avail ourselves of all the information those who have visited those lands were willing to communicate, comparing the facts thus obtained with official statistics. Our next care, before writing a line for publication on the subject, was to ascertain what is the character of the class of persons generally engaged in the petroleum business. The result of our researches may be briefly stated as follows: We are satisfied that there is an abundance of petroleum in the country—so much that the amount has hardly been exaggerated even by those most anxious to create a sensation; we are equally convinced that many of those engaged in the business in both this city and Philadelphia are men of the strictest integrity and of ample resources; but for every one of this class there are at least twenty of the opposite—persons possessed neither of integrity nor means.

A little reflection will show that this is no worse, after all, than we should expect. Thus, for example, we have counted one hundred and ninety New York petroleum companies. The capitals claimed by these vary from $200,000 up to $10,000,000. Five millions, four millions, three millions &c. are quite common. In Philadelphia there are three hundred and thirty-nine companies to which the same general remarks

will apply. Nor can it be said that either list gives the full number; we are assured that there are at least fifty companies whose names have not yet found their way into the public statistics. But leaving these out of the question, what a fabulous amount of millions do the petroleum companies exhibit in the shape of figures! Are there any making any pretensions to intelligence who believe that one twentieth part of the grand total has any real existence in one form or other under the control of those who proclaim tha they have it? If there be they will one day find themselves mistaken.

But we cheerfully admit that this is no valid objection against investing money in petroleum; it only shows that those intending to do so should be cautious—that they should not only reflect, but institute inquiries. In the mean time, we will note such facts as we think may aid the inexperienced in arriving at safe conclusions. Among the many pamphlets got up by petroleum companies which have reached our table, that of the California Company was the first to attract our attention as substantial and reliable, not because it announces a capital of ten millions ($10,000,000), but because it contains sufficient internal evidence of genuineness altogether independently of money. Scientific men have visited the Company's oil lands for the express purpose of testing their productiveness, and have published the results of their researches. Thus, in a letter dated July 2, 1864, at Buenaventura, Santa Barbara county, Professor Benjamin Silliman advises his friends in New York to purchase the Ojai ranch:

"The property covers an area of 18,000 (eighteen thousand) acres in one body, on which are at present some twenty natural oil-wells, some of them of the largest size. The oil is struggling to the surface at every available point, and is running away down the rivers for miles and miles. Artesian wells will be fruitful along a double line of thirteen miles, say, for at least twenty-five miles in linear extent. The ranch is an old Spanish grant, of four leagues of land,* lately confirmed, and of perfect title. It has, as I said, about eighteen thousand acres in it of the finest land, watered by four rivers, and measuring, in a right line, in all near thirteen miles. As a ranch it is a splendid estate, *but its value is its almost fabulous wealth in the best of oil.*"

There are other passages in the Professor's Report which

* It is claimed that this ranch is included between certain natural boundaries, as rivers on the east and west, and ranges of mountains on the north and south; and should this claim be established, the extent of the property will probably reach full *eleven* leagues, or about 48,000 acres. The title to four leagues, which include the most valuable portion of the oil-lands on this ranch, has been confirmed by the United States Court.

speak in still more unqualified terms of the same tract (which is that now owned by the California Petroleum Company), and his statements are fully corroborated by the Report of Col. James Williamson. But still more satisfactory than all this is the character of the principal officers and directors of the Company, several of whom are men of wealth, who are as much distinguished for their integrity as for their business talents.

Another substantial corporation is the New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore Consolidated Petroleum Company, which has a capital of $1,500,000. From a pamphlet similar to that just noticed, we see that this company has no fewer than twenty-six different properties, amounting to about 635 acres, all situated in the following oil regions, viz.: Oil Creek, Cherry Run, Cherry Tree Run, Alleghany River, opposite Horse Creek, Sugar Creek, Elk Creek, and other streams. In this extent there are thirteen wells, which, although but partially bored, are already producing a large quantity of oil. In the vicinity of these are the Phillips well, which when struck produced 4,000 barrels per day; the Woodford well, which produced 2,000; the Sherman well, which produced 3,000, &c. There is quite a number of other wells in the same neighborhood, which yield from 150 to 1,000 barrels daily. That immense wealth will be realized from the thirteen wells alluded to can scarcely admit of a doubt.

Nor do we hesitate to assign a similar rank, in all that is essential to inspire public confidence, to the Ironsides Petroleum Company. The President of the Ironsides is one of the wealthiest of our citizens. We believe he has at least four stores in Broadway, each doing a large business; and there are several of the trustees to whom similar remarks apply with equal force, being the representatives of leading houses of New York, Boston and Philadelphia. The wells of this company now in operation produce from forty to two hundred and fifty barrels daily.

Companies of the opposite character are to be met with in scores; and it is they that make the loudest pretensions. Half of them have not as much as an office, and those that have cannot afford decent furniture for it. Among the latter we notice as "officers" persons formerly engaged as runners, drummers, and bullies by the insurance quacks. It is scarcely necessary to say that this enterprising class offer splendid inducements, to those who are tired of their money and

wish to be eased of it in a quiet manner. None have finer or more productive oil lands, as they can as easily command $750,000 as $100—that is, if their word will only be taken for the difference until they can dig a new well! Companies of this stamp have generally the most attractive names; they think because the imagination is the principal faculty they have to work upon, care should be taken to make an agreeable impression on it at the outset. It is true that a company may have a name very suggestive of moonshine, or soft soap, and still be very reliable. We are told, for example, that this is the case with a corporation entitled the "Good Hope Petroleum Company of New York," and we are bound for various reasons to believe it. If it has no office, or no wells, so far as we are aware, it has for its presiding officer a gentleman who wears a broad-brimmed hat, calls himself a banker and commission merchant, and is so modest and retiring as to keep both his bank and his merchandize in a small room up stairs; and it presents a further claim on public confidene in having for its secretary a gentleman distinguished for that peculiar style of politeness characteristic of the Bowery, and, who like the famous individual who dragged his coat tail through the mud, defying the bravest to tread thereon, dares any one to find fault with the Good Hope! A company thus officered cannot be otherwise than reliable; and, of course must ultimately succeed. Let no one think, therefore, that the Forlorn Hope—we mean the Good Hope—is one of those spurious corporations against whose operations we would warn the unsophisticated.

A large proportion of the presidents and vice-presidents of our petroleum companies are exchange brokers (vulgarly called note-shavers) of the smallest kind—persons who have served an apprenticeship to operations like charging five cents for giving postage currency for a dollar bill, so that the party receiving the change may ride in the omnibus without running the risk of being insulted by the driver. All of a sudden these become very important personages. Their names and titles appear in large letters on the doors of the little closets which they call their offices, and in which they always pretend to be doing an immense amount of business.

It is really worth while to visit a score of these places, none having any sense of the ludicrous, or any disposition to observe the *modus operandi* of imposing on credulity by means of *oily* stories, in broken English, would think their time

e misspent on such an excursion. A countryman having ile of greenbacks, of which he does not know how to dis-e, and seems as if he was in a hurry to get rid of it, enters office, two or three flights up stairs, and asks for the pres-nt. He is told that that functionary is presiding at a cial meeting of the directors, the company having deter-ed to add another million to its capital stock; or that he ngaged in signing receipts for stock, which had accumu-d on the previous day. The countryman looks about, "Directors' Room" on one door, "President's Private ce" on another, "Vice-President's Private Office" on ther, &c. He is convinced that there must be a great ount of oil behind so many doors; although if he would mine them a little sharply, it is ten to one but he would that *all lead to one room*, which is by no means a large ; and that the meeting of the directors, with the presi-t at their head, is nothing more than a smoking-party, isting of persons whose sole duty it is to make a fuss ut the office, now as directors, and anon as purchasers of ck, who have no doubt that they can make their fortune such and such wells, the like of which they are sure no er company can pretend to own.

Inside a little railing sits another functionary, who is evi-ntly very busily engaged in filling up receipts for stock, enclosing "forms of application" to persons who have itten not only from all parts of the United States and itish America, but also from several of the West India nds. Who can doubt, after seeing all this, that there will no stock left in a few days? Lest any might be so stupid not to take this view of the case, placards are posted in ferent corners of the room, announcing the books are just out to close; and that should there be any more stock ld after a certain early day, the amount for each share uld have to be raised at least one hundred per cent.; the dy who does not know what to do with his money order to make a fortune in the quickest possible time, s not hesitate any longer; he eases himself of his pile of nbacks; the functionary at the desk receives the money th a very long face, or with an air from which the late ner is expected to infer that he ought to be very grateful the privilege of investing it in a manner so certain to pro-e a fortune in a short time.

One goes to another quarter and finds a half dozen com-ies "consolidated" into one, which, of course, has an

enormous capital. The officers of this are principally broken-down politicians, whose subordinates are ex-auctioneers, or ex-travelling agents for manufacturers of patent medicines. Each of these has visited the oil lands of the company, and is quite sure that there are no other lands like them. They contain from twenty-five to fifty wells already bored, which of course yield a fabulous number of hogsheads daily of the finest oil. What, then, may be expected when twenty other wells have been bored, in a locality which the most learned chemists and geologists have pronounced superior to any other in the oil regions? According to the gentlemen who give this information, all other companies are pretenders—they alone are honest men, who would take nobody's money without feeling satisfied that he could not invest it to better advantage.

The vice-president interrupts his colleagues by enumerating about two dozen of uses to which petroleum can be turned. The question with him is not what can it do? but what can it *not* do? Nor is this merely his opinion, although no one has studied the whole affair more thoroughly than he. He merely gives the views of the most celebrated scientific men. While making this modest observation, in his own peculiar phraseology, he pulls a petroleum weekly journal from under the cushion of his seat, and exhibits in triumph the opinion of Professor Jenkins, the celebrated chemist, who maintains that petroleum was produced by the innumerable animals destroyed by the universal deluge, some time before the rainbow was given as a sign to Noah that there would be no such general destruction ever again.

On the same learned authority it is shown that petroleum is used as an ingredient in various articles of food; the vice-president mentioning the finest candy as an instance—and affirming that there is no constituent of that article more wholesome, especially for children affected with the asthma. The secretary entirely agrees with the vice-president as to the nutritive properties of petroleum, but he has seen the opinion of other great chemists in his Weekly Petroleum, who maintain that it is a vulgar error to suppose that there were any animals in existence, except perhaps the scorpion, when the great oil deposits were first made. According to the latter authority, plants were equally scarce in those times, so that we must not give vegetables, more than animals, the credit of having produced the wonderful substance which is to revolutionize the world, and which already causes the despots of Europe to tremble at the destiny that awaits them!

Turning to another office, one finds a fraternity consisting principally of ex-military officers, chieftains who were requested to resign their commissions for their excess of bravery in running too precipitately after the rebels in the direction in which they were *not* to be found. The benevolence and generosity of these gentlemen are unbounded. Far from taking offence at finding their services so badly appreciated, they resolve that since they are not privileged to serve their country with steel or powder, they must do it with oil. The amount of pay they got from the army was very slight, and if they have any very extensive property, it is not visible either to the bailiff or the tax collector; but their capital stock embraces nearly as many hundreds of thousands as that of the auctioneers and the pedlars of quack medicines. It is easy to understand why the oil lands of this company are situated chiefly, if not exclusively, in Virginia. In pursuing the rebels so closely, they could hardly avoid making geological discoveries. When tired of running in a marshy country, they would naturally turn to some dyke or well to wash off the mud and perspiration; and if too much soap was required for the operation, the clear inference was that there was oil not far off!

In short, the wonder is, how a people who ought to be intelligent and thoughtful, permit themselves to be swindled in so vulgar a manner. It is idle to deny the fact that no other people in the world are cheated on so large a scale; one take less pains to scrutinize the character or the motives of those who pretend to enrich them, or lengthen their lives for a consideration. Those who tell us the most glaring and absurd lies are the surest to be believed. And what does all this imply? Does it not show that, let us boast of our free schools as we will, they do not teach us to think? for one who thinks, in the proper sense of the term, could never be convinced that an ignorant charlatan can cure all diseases that flesh is heir to. But that a large proportion of our people do believe it, is, unfortunately for themselves, but too evident. We also have more faith in the mysterious and supernatural than any other people possessed of equal advantages. We suffer the most vulgar mountebanks to impose upon us in this way, and enrich themselves at our expense; whereas if those parties, emboldened by their success amongst us, attempt to defraud others in a similar manner, even the most ignorant of the populace soon discover the cheat, and treat them with the scorn and contumely which

they deserve. A notable instance of this occurred recently in Liverpool, where a set of impostors who had made a fortune in New York, during the winter, were only saved with difficulty by the police from the hands of the mob. Our great showman but narrowly escaped a similar fate when he went about from town to town to glorify his imposition on the credulity of our people.

But let us hope that we are not so easily imposed upon by the speculators in bubbles as we are by the quack doctors, the showmen, and the spirit rappers; and yet the fact that so large a number of petroleum companies have already been formed, with the view of enriching themselves with our money, rather conflicts with that theory. There must be vast numbers who pay out their money to the speculators; otherwise the latter would not be multiplying weekly as they are. When we wrote some three years since, on the quackery of insurance companies, we thought we could hardly warn our people against worse speculators. It was far from our intention to denounce the system in general, or pretend that it was not productive of incalculable good; then, as we do now, we confined our strictures to the pretenders and impostors. But our sincere opinion now is, after having fully investigated the subject of this article, that even the quacks who cling, incubus-like, to the insurance profession are more respectable men, and more worthy of faith in their word or oath, than the corresponding class belonging to the petroleum companies. As for legitimate underwriters, there are no class in whose truthfulness and integrity we have more unwavering faith. In proof of this we need only say that the best two petroleum companies we know, namely, the California and the Ironsides, have each underwriters connected with them; and that nothing else has inspired us with more confidence than this fact in their resources and intentions; whereas, so far as we have been able to ascertain, no class of men, not excepting the most ignorant and unprincipled of the quack doctors, have so little regard for truth, or are so much prone to falsehood, as the generality of the petroleum speculators. We disclaim all personal feeling, however, against any company or individual engaged in the petroleum business, in one way or other; we merely give our opinion as public journalists of what we have carefully examined; nor is it our wish, in doing so, that any one suffer the least detriment further than his conduct may be found, on due enquiry, to merit it. Without any disposition

boast of our efforts, we think we may claim that our criti-
ms on insurance have been productive of good; encour-
ed by this belief, we shall have more to say on the present
bject; and while it will afford us pleasure to note im-
ovements, and do justice to those whom we think act
norably and fairly, we shall not shrink from unmasking
se of the opposite character.

T. VIII. *Opera Omnia.* EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. Stock-
holm, 1780.

2. *The Complete Works* of EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

THE study of a great man's life seldom fails to impress us
h emotions of grandeur. If he had vices, we forgive the
re readily when the grave has closed over them, and the
tim is insensible alike to the praises he coveted or the
ıtumely he defied. If to the graces of intellect he added
symmetry of moral and social virtues, his memory stands
from the receding past like some rare ruin of olden time,
ore whose broken columns we reverently linger to read
h lessons as the heart only accepts from death and
ay.

The lives of all reformers are especially suggestive, since
ough them we trace the progress both of civilization and
gious toleration; and, although the doctrines they have
erally taught have been sometimes dogmatic and pro-
tive of bloodshed, we acknowledge the mental audacity
he man who dared to announce himself as the founder of
w sect, and in the face of established religions, deeply
ted prejudices, and future persecutions, proclaimed him-
the vicegerent of God. It is difficult to believe that
e men intentionally deceived either themselves or others.
re differ intellectually to such a degree that no two indi-
uals agree in regard to the most tangible objects of sense,
should we expect mankind to become a unit when rea-
ng upon the impalpable tenets of faith?

Whatever may have been the imperfections of Sweden-
, it is generally admitted that he was a sincere Christian,
beral thinker, as well as a most earnest enquirer after
h. The "illuminations" which for twenty-seven years he
ninutely detailed, and to the investigation of which he

cheerfully invited all who approached him with friendly intentions, have obtained for him a celebrity, not unlike, but so far beyond all other prophets, as to render him pre-eminently a visionist. That these illuminations should have been eagerly received by the ignorant would excite little surprise; but when we find among his converts and admirers such distinguished personages as the King of Sweden, Count Von Höpken, Oberlin, Lavater, Beyer, Coleridge, Emanuel Kant, Oetinger, together with innumerable professors, assessors, landgraves, bishops, and archbishops, all contemporary with Swedenborg, and enjoying personal and collateral advantages for accurate judgment, it certainly becomes us to approach with modesty an investigation which has baffled enquirers like these.

It is well known that the earlier period of his life, when men are most liable to be led astray by their imaginations was devoted to chemical, mathematical, and philosophical researches, which must have effectually precluded all vagaries; nor did his illuminations commence until he had established a literary reputation so irreproachable that his assertions were accepted as truth. If we regard him as an impostor, his whole life is a living refutation of the accusation. That a man so unobtrusive, so regardless of honor and wealth, should have imposed upon the credulity of friendship falsehoods which could in no way subserve his interest, would be a phenomenon without parallel in the history of the world. If we question his sanity, we are met by the assurance that in all cases the insane are found incapable of prolonged, connected mental effort, so that the books Swedenborg wrote, the languages he learned, the correspondence he has left, all bear conclusive evidence that his mental powers were unimpaired. In whatever aspect we regard this man, he is still a mystery.

Emanuel Swedberg, afterwards Swedenborg, was born in Stockholm, Sweden, January 29, 1688, and was the second child of Jesper Swedenberg, Bishop of Skara, in West Gothland, a man of considerable ability as well as celebrity; having been elected not only a member of the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign countries, but also appointed by Charles XII., King of Sweden, Bishop over the Swedish churches in Pennsylvania and London. During the year 1719, the family were ennobled by Queen Ulrica Eleonora, receiving the name of Swedenborg. The father never availed himself of this queenly consideration, but

manuel, together with his sisters, assumed the name, and e immediately ranked with the Equestrian Order in the iennial assemblies of the states of the realm. He was also, y invitation, a Fellow of the Royal Academy of Sciences at tockholm, but seems never to have been a member of any ther literary society; for the reason, as he affirms, "that e attentions of literary societies relate to the world and the dy."

As a boy, he was amiable and studious, and early gave omise of literary success. His education, which was the st the country at that time afforded, was so judiciously con-ucted that we find him taking the degree of Doctor of Phi-sophy at the University of Nysal, and publishing an academ-al dissertation in 1709. In the year following, he made his st visit to London. During this voyage his life was four mes in danger: from wreck, pirates, and his imprudence in aving his ship while in quarantine; for this offence he was ar being hung, and was only freed on condition that if any her attempted to imitate his example, he should not escape e gallows.

In 1710, Swedenborg published at Skara a collection of tin verses, which not only bear witness to his accomplish-ents as a student and linguist, but are also indicative of at versatile genius for which he was afterwards distin-uished. These have been reprinted, together with other uthful effusions, under the title of *Ludus Heliconius Sive rmina Miscellanea quæ variis in locis cecinit:* Em. Swed-rg. During the years 1716–17–18, he published at Stock-lm a work in six parts, under the title of *Dædalus Hyper-reus*, made up of essays upon the various branches of thematics and philosophy, displaying so much ability in e science of mechanics that it attracted general attention; d secured to him not only the friendship of many learned en, but of his Majesty Charles XII., who, after some per-nal interviews with the author, appointed him to the office assessor of the Metallic College, in which he remained til it was voluntarily resigned in the year 1747; although continued to enjoy the whole or a portion of the salary ring his life.

In 1718, Swedenborg executed the skilful manœuvre of nsporting two galleys, five large boats, and a sloop from onestadt to Kerfjol, by means of machines of his own in-tion. When it is remembered that the distance is about rteen English miles, and that the country is divided by

mountains and valleys, and that it was under the cover these same galleys and boats the heavy artillery was tra ported on pontoons, which did such effectual service duri the siege of Frederickshall, this triumph of mechanical genuity will be the better appreciated. In 1719 he gave the public a series of treatises, including "A proposal fixing the value of coins and determining the measures Sweden, so as to suppress fractions and facilitate calcu tions;" on the "Position of the earth and planets;" on t "Height of the tides, and the greater flux and reflux of t sea in former ages, with proofs furnished by various appe ances in Sweden."

Although Swedenborg had been appointed assessor by Majesty Charles XII., he did not enter upon the duties his office. Always unassuming, and never overrating mental resources, he hesitated to act in a capacity for wh he believed himself unqualified. Wishing to instruct hi self in the buildings, machines, and processes most succe fully used among miners, he went to Hartz and Saxony 1721, and visited not only the smelting works and min but libraries, museums, and such public institutions as wo naturally attract the attention of so cultivated a travell This journey was very successful. The reigning soverei Duke Lewis Rodolph, received him with signal favors, gra ing him full permission to visit his dominions, besides p senting him with his medallion both in gold and silver.

Returning to his native country in 1722, Swedenb presented the fruits of his foreign industry. He had alre published at Amsterdam six small works, which were af wards collected in one volume as "Some specimens of a w on the principles of chemistry, with other treatises." now published a work in four parts, entitled *Miscellanea servata circa res naturales; præsertim mineralia, ignem et ticum strata* (Miscellaneous observations on natural thin particularly on minerals, fire, and the strata of mountains

All these testimonials of Swedenborg's mental wea seem to have dropped from his overburdened pen, rather a relief to his own intellectual plethora, than from th ambitious aspirations that are supposed to inspire most thors. He is a wise man who can render himself neces to his superiors by being useful to his equals. Swedenb seldom, if ever, solicited patronage, nor does he appear have given much thought to his literary productions af having prepared them to the best of his ability for the be

fit of his fellow-men. Fortunately they fell at the feet of an appreciating public, creating for him an *éclat* despite his modesty—making him noble against his democratic will. Various and brilliant as these labors had been, they were but the lesser pyrotechnics with which he attracted the attention, not only of Sweden, but of all Europe.

In 1734 appeared his *Opera Philosophica et Mineralogica*, upon the preparation of which he is supposed to have been engaged during many years, and which were published at Dresden and Leipsic, in three folio volumes, at the expense of the Duke of Brunswick, at whose court Swedenborg had been so favorably received. The first volume was dedicated to the duke, and published by him in elegant style, being adorned not only with a likeness of the author, but with numerous fine engravings illustrative of the subjects of which the volume treated. In this work, sparkling throughout with mental brilliants, Swedenborg has vindicated his claim to an intellectual peerage, and is supposed to have originated many discoveries in philosophy, which, owing to his works being at one period much neglected, have not been attributed to him. In it he endeavors to unlock the mysteries of the causes and origin of the phenomena of the universe, asserting that in all her operations nature is governed by one general law, and is always self-consistent; while experience, the power of arrangement, and the ability to reason are sufficient to enable us to solve her most intricate problems. The second volume of the *Opera* includes the liquefaction of iron—its conversion into steel, with experiments and chemical preparations made with iron and its oxides. Volume third treats of the liquefaction of copper—its separation from silver—its conversion into brass and other metals, and the second is embellished with many copper-plate engravings.

Six years after the appearance of this work, Swedenborg published at Amsterdam, the *Œconomia Regni Animalis* (Economy of the Animal Kingdom), in which he sought to discover the correspondence of the soul with the body. It is in the pages of this volume we catch our first glimpses of those peculiar theories for which he was afterwards distinguished. Whether or not we endorse the conclusions which his subtle reasonings led him to embrace, we cannot but admire the unflinching temerity of mind and purpose with which he plunges into the labyrinth of symbols, and endeavors to wrest from heaven the secrets of the soul. For

this purpose he examines every link in the animal kingdom and dissects mankind with a scalpel keener than steel. Th grandeur of his theme fascinates our mind, while his simple unwavering faith thrills us with indefinable hope. If w close the volume with a sigh of regret, we nevertheless thin kindly of the author who so unintentionally cheated both th reader and himself. In the *Introduction to the Regnum An male*, published in 1744, Swedenborg thus naively confesse his failure to establish the correspondence he sought: "No long ago, I published the *Œconomia Regni Animalis*, it tended to be digested into several sections; but I only com pleted the section relating to the blood, its arteries, an heart, as also to the motion and cortex of the brain; I like wise, before passing through the whole of the intended cours took a compendious way to the soul, on which subject also published a Prodromus. I have discovered, however, o deeper consideration, that I had been too quick and hast in my steps, whilst I was attempting to attain a knowledg of the soul, merely from an enquiry into the nature of th blood and its appropriate organs. But I was urged on b the ardor of my desire to arrive at the knowledge of the sub ject."

Nor was Swedenborg discouraged by his failure, for h adds: "I have determined not to desist from this part of m task until I have traversed the whole field above mentione even to the goal; in other words, until I have explored th whole animal kingdom, even to the soul." With this i tent, he patiently renews his investigations in the "Anim Kingdom," a work that cannot fail to rivet the attention the most sceptical reader. In the human body the auth finds an image of the whole creation. Then comes the do trines of forms: all the movements of the animal kingdo are angular; those seen in the bodily organization, in the ci culation of the blood are circular; the highest form is th spiral, and that becomes the type of the spirit. The do trine of forms develops the doctrine of series, in which ever thing in nature is made to consist of a series of organic atoms, and so on, until he approaches the province of th spirit itself.

With the *De Cultu et Amore Dei*, published in London in 174 terminated the scientific and philosophical works of Emanu Swedenborg. As we linger regretfully over the period wh his expansive intellect seems to have culminated, it is w to glance at his social position as revealed in his diary a

orrespondence. In a letter written to the Rev. Dr. Hartly, e says: "I live on terms of familiarity and friendship with l the bishops of my county, who are ten in number; also ith the sixteen senators, and the rest of the nobility; the ng and queen also, and the three princes, their sons, show e much favor. I was once invited by the king and queen dine at their table, an honor which is, in general, granted ly to the nobility of the highest rank, and likewise, since, ith the hereditary prince." * We have already noticed the yal favors bestowed upon him both at home and abroad. he world must be greatly changed if then, as now, it ould not smile when royalty was complaisant. His extenve correspondence bears witness not only to his intellectual ppreciation, but to his numerous private virtues. "A man," ys Count Von Höpken, "who, like me, has lived long in he world, must have had numerous opportunities of knowng men as to their virtues and vices, their weakness and rength; and in consequence thereof, I do not recollect to ave known any man of more uniformly virtuous character han Swedenborg."

During the year 1745, Swedenborg commenced his "illuinations," resigned his office as assessor, and thenceforward evoted himself exclusively to those spiritual investigations hich ultimately laid the foundation of the "New Church."† rom his childhood he seems to have been of a peculiarly peculative and impressible nature. He tells us that at four ears of age he commenced to think and reason upon spiritual things, and to endeavor to regulate his breathings to the ulsations of his heart. In maturer years, and long before is illuminations commenced, he was accustomed to remain reathless sometimes during an hour, inhaling only air enough o enable him to think. This condition he afterwards found o be the most favorable for angelic intercourse, and it is reognised by the New Church as the *second breath*.

If Swedenborg has correctly described this phenomenon, t is nearly akin to the nervous prostrations which are known o attend upon prolonged religious excitements at the preent day, and should have received little attention save from is physician. Nor does the fact that he reasoned accurately pon other subjects necessarily imply that he was able to nderstand his own infirmities, since it is contrary to medical perience that a diseased nervous system should be sensible the absurdities of its own phenomena.

* Hobart's Life of Swedenborg, p. 24. † *Ib.*

Swedenborg tells us, that previous to his communion with spirits, he commenced to see flames of great brilliancy and of various colors and magnitude. Scarcely a day passed but he saw a flame as vivid as a flame of fire, which he interpreted as a sign of approbation and confirmation. Those who are familiar with the incipient stages of insanity recognise in this mental *ignis fatuus* only the precursor of evil. That Swedenborg was himself doubtful as to the nature of these manifestations is evident from many passages in his diary, written at the time of their occurrence. Alluding to the difficulty of persuading one's self that he is ruled by spirits, he says, "I had manifestations by various ways from evil spirits in temptations, whilst I was writing such things as evil spirits were averse to, so that I was beset *almost to horror;* fiery lights were seen; talking was heard in the morning time; besides many other things; until at last, when a certain spirit addressed me in a few words, I wondered greatly that he should perceive my thoughts, and afterwards wondered exceedingly when the way was opened so that I could converse with spirits, and then the spirit wondered I should be so surprised. From these things it may be concluded how difficult it is for man to be led to believe that he is ruled by the Lord through spirits, and with what difficulty he recedes from the opinion that he lives his own life from himself without spirits."*

Those who have listened to the mental horrors of the insane, as vividly remembered and described by themselves after their restoration to reason, can see nothing but grief in the tenacity with which his overtasked intellect quivered upon its equipoise, and thrust back its thick-coming fancies One can well nigh hear the shriek of despair with which dethroned reason acknowledged her downfall. Swedenborg tells us he was twice commanded to write what he was penning; and that once he saw the representation of a golden key, with which he was to open the door of spiritual things. In one of his relations, he adds in the margin that it was foretold him by an angel who descended to earth with a written paper in his right hand, the writing of which, from flashing with splendor, changed from gold color to silver, then to copper, to iron, and afterwards to iron-rust and brass-rust color, finally became invisible to most of the spirits; some few, however, who had been in "simple faith from

*Aug. 27, 1748.

ity, or in some truth from good," recognised a man "with coming dress, and a paper on which letters were traced." r some effort the writing was deciphered, and the inctions of the angel delivered.

These presages of Swendenborg's illumination are admitby his biographers to be all that are known; the reader t judge how far they are worthy of being received as of ne origin. The first actual vision occurred some months r, and is recorded April, 1745. Being at dinner, Swedborg perceived a vapor exuding from the pores of his f, which, falling upon the carpet, turned into little worms, ch were immediately consumed with a loud noise; an el, in the meanwhile, explaining to him, that this curious n typified the evils to which sensual indulgence would, ect him. The following night the same spiritual man n appeared to him, this time clothed in purple and redent in light, and announced himself as follows: "I am the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer; I have chosen to explain to men the interior and spiritual sense of the ed writings; I will dictate unto thee what thou oughtest rite." Upon the same night were opened to him his eptions of the heavens and hells.

Heaven is represented by Swedenborg as being in the e of man. God is the Grand man, from whom emanates divine love which pervades all things, giving light and and life to the inhabitants of the heavens which are ded into societies according to their spiritual developits, and have no correspondence with each other except ugh the spiritual influx. These different societies have r locations assigned them according to their respective its. Those in possession of "every good" have an influx the head, while those who are in the enjoyment of the od" of charity and faith find their influx in the breast. se pre-eminent for understanding are located in the eyes; se for attention and obedience, in the ears; for underding and perception, in the mouth. Infants appear in t over against the forehead, directly in the line of the ne in which angels look to the Lord. The good for ch each society is distinguished is written upon the ane countenance, so as to be recognisable to each other, precluding the possibility of evil spirits and hypocrites aining amongst them.

The angels are represented as having bodies which are hed in garments of flame color, purple, violet, and white,

the last being typical of the greatest degree of purity. Those who have attained perfection require no personal adornment. They reside in habitations like our own; in elegant palaces and beautiful houses, adorned with trees and flowers of inconceivable beauty. The architecture of heaven, we are assured, is such that one would believe he beheld "*the art itself.*" There is also an atmosphere in which the sound of their speech is articulated, and angels express their ideas, not unlike us, by voice and gesture, and the expressions of the face. The language is both interior and exterior, and they have also "a kind of thundering speech." Marriage and conjugal love also exist among them, but the alliance is grounded in "infinite love." There exist both rich and poor as upon earth; nor are those who have been in poverty while living here below, regarded with any preference on account of it, but only so far as they have been virtuous and humble in heart. The chirography of the angels is described as being remarkably expressive. Swedenborg tells us, that, having received a bit of paper from one of the angels, he found it covered with Hebrew characters, every jot and curvature of which were pregnant with meaning.

Hell is represented as loathsome to the last degree of degradation and filth. This is also divided into societies, but there is an intermediate condition into which spirits enter immediately after death, and where they have an abundant opportunity to examine their own hearts, and analyse their good and bad propensities. This being done, they voluntarily plunge themselves into that portion of Hades to which their individual sins entitle them. The misery of these unfortunates consist not in their being rejected of God, since they condemn and punish themselves; but in the evil passions of their own hearts, and in living contrary to the order of heaven. Neither does the happiness of heaven consist in devotions alone; but its inhabitants are constantly employed in kindly offices to each other, and are perfected in bliss in proportion as they love and benefit others without any regard to themselves.

Many interesting incidents are mentioned in connection with Swedenborg's illumination, which would naturally excite attention from those unaccustomed to investigate the idiocrasies of the insane, and are curious partly from the mystery that envelopes them, but still more from the effect, a belief in their divine origin has exerted upon the minds of others. Among the most remarkable is that occurring about

ly after the death of the Prince of Prussia. Swedenborg being in conversation with Queen Louisa Ulrica, sister of the prince, was enquired of by her, if he had seen her brother, to which he replied in the negative; when the queen added jestingly, "if you should see him, remember me to him." Eight days after, Swedenborg came again to court, so early that the queen had not left her apartment, called the white room, where she was conversing with her maids of honor. Without waiting to be announced, he passed directly into the apartment and whispered in her ear. The queen, overwhelmed with astonishment, was taken ill, and did not recover for some time. After she was come to herself, she said to those about her, "There is only God and my brother who can know what he has just told me." Swedenborg had informed her of her last correspondence with the prince her brother.

The story of the lost receipt, although so often brought forward as an unanswerable proof of Swedenborg's supernatural powers, is simply as follows: An ambassador from Holland, named Marteville, died at Stockholm. After his death a large sum was demanded of his widow in payment of a debt. Although she was confident the debt had been liquidated during the life of her husband, she was unable to find the receipt, and in her anxiety applied to to Swedenborg, begging him to ascertain of her husband, if possible, what had been done with it. Swedenborg replied that, "if he met her husband in the spiritual world, he would enquire in regard to it." "This soon happened," says Swedenborg, "and M. Marteville told me he would himself go to his house on the following night, to see after the receipt." This, we have his own authority for stating, was all the part he took in the matter; but the lady "spoke with her husband in a dream, and he told her where to find the missing document in a private bureau," and she did find it there as her husband directed. Swedenborg's agency in its discovery is very questionable, if he himself is to be believed, and the old adage "*we find that of which we dream*," renders it exceedingly probable that others have been as successful dreamers as the lady here referred to.

While in Gottenburg, Swedenborg foretold to his friends there, three days in advance of the post, the great fire that happened at Stockholm, in 1756. Having arrived at Gottenburg from England, he was invited, together with fifteen other persons, to the house of Mr. William Castel. About six

o'clock Swedenborg went out and returning manifested much uneasiness, saying that a great fire had just broken out in Stockholm, at the Sudermalm, and was spreading rapidly. He continued restless, and went out often, saying that the house of his friends was already in ashes, and his own in danger. At eight o'clock, after he had been out again, he joyfully exclaimed, "Thank God, the fire is extinguished the third door from my house." This occurred upon Saturday. Swedenborg's prediction having reached the governor, he was sent for and questioned, not only by him, but very many who had friends and property at Stockholm, to all of which enquiries Swedenborg made answer to the same effect. On Monday evening, a messenger arrived at Gottenburg, who had been despatched during the fire, and who corroborated Swendenborg's prediction. The above incident is related by the German philosopher, Emanuel Kant, in a letter addressed to Madam de Knoblock, in which, after asserting that he had thoroughly examined into the truth of the story, he modestly adds, "I am not aware that anybody has ever perceived in me an inclination to the marvellous, or a weakness approaching credulity."

This incident, which at first glance seems so miraculous, appears less unanswerable when we connect the circumstance of Swedenborg's "going out," with the fact that Gottenburg was no more than fifty miles from Stockholm—that the fire breaking out at six o'clock in the month of September, renders it not improbable that some appearance of the sky in the direction of Stockholm betrayed the existence of the fire to his experienced eye, as well as the time of its subsiding; and as for the little embellishments, one might consider the *uncxaggerated* relation of any such incident to be more marvellous than the circumstances themselves. We do not find, however, that Swedenborg ever asserted the truthfulness of the fact that he did predict the fire, and he does assert in reply to enquirers, in more cases than one, that other incidents, which received credenc e in regard to him, were without foundation.

It is presumed to be true that Swedenborg predicted the time of his death. Many similar instances of prescience might be cited, but neither the one nor the other have been satisfactorily accounted for. The interviews which occurred between Swedenborg and the illustrious dead are not without interest. He affirms that he spoke with Paul during a whole year, three times with John, and very many times with Lu-

ther, who owned to him that although warned to the contrary by an angel, he had received the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, merely for the purpose of making an entire separation from the Church of Rome. He spoke once with Moses. It is related of him, that upon one occasion a distinguished Finlander, going to London, availed himself of that opportunity to visit Swedenborg, who was residing there at the time. Being ushered into the reception room, and informed that Swedenborg already had company with him, he was left alone to await his coming. As he had taken his seat near the inner door, he could not avoid hearing the lively conversation which was passing within the adjoining room, accompanied with the sound of footsteps pacing up and down the floor. The conversation was in Latin, and respecting the antiquities of Rome, a subject in which the young stranger was deeply interested. He was surprised, however, to observe that the conversation was carried on throughout with only one voice speaking, between pauses of longer or shorter duration, during which the speaker seemed to obtain satisfactory answers, and was incited to new enquiries. While the stranger remained absorbed in both the manner and the subject-matter of the conversation, the door opened, and Swedenborg, passing him with a friendly salutation, conducted his imaginary visitant out of the opposite door with many bows, all the while expressing in fluent Latin, the gratification the visit had afforded him, and begging an early repetition of it. This leave-taking over, he approached the Finlander with much cordiality, saying, "Excuse me for making you wait! I had, as you observed, a visitor." The stranger, embarrassed, answered, "Yes, I observed it." "And can you guess whom?" asked Swedenborg. "Impossible," replied the other. "Only think, my dear sir, Virgil! and so you know he is a fine and pleasant fellow. I have always had a good opinion of the man, and he deserves it. He is as modest as he is witty, and most agreeably entertaining." Although this singular interview impressed the Finlander with the belief that he was conversing with an insane man, he afterwards visited him several times, and perceived nothing extraordinary excepting his monstrous mental resources and learning.

Swedenborg, having met the Empress Elizabeth of Russia in the world of spirits, said he had seen no one so splendidly served and waited upon, and gives the following incongruous reason for her happy condition: That although she had many faults,

she possessed a very good heart; that her neglect or indifference induced her intentionally to postpone signing the edicts and papers presented to her until they accumulated to such a degree that she could no longer examine them, when she was obliged to submit to the decisions of her ministers and sign as many as possible; after which weakness she retired to her closet, fell upon her knees, and begged foregiveness of God if she had signed anything that was wrong.

During these seasons of spiritual intercourse, his countenance was pallid; his eyes, when open, luminous, and his mental abstraction so complete that his most intimate friends forebore to address him. Upon one occasion, when he had remained in this condition more than an hour, uttering broken sentences, with his hand uplifted, and his eyes partially closed, he was found to be greatly prostrated, but soon returned to his former cheerfulness, remarking that he had been conversing with spirits.

At the time of the Diet at Norkjobing, Swedenborg had a chest sent from England, containing copies of his religious works. These books were retained in the custom-house under the law prohibiting books contrary to the established religion. During the sitting of the Diet of 1769, members of the ecclesiastical order purposed bringing him to trial, and disposing of him at once as an insane man. One of the senators discovered this plot to Swedenborg, who was so overcome with their unkindness, that retiring to his garden he fell upon his knees and with many tears besought the divine protection. He was doubtless indebted to the fact that he was himself a member of the House of Nobles, and related not only to many noble families, but to distinguished ecclesiastics, for the continuation of his freedom. In this, as well as in many other events of his life, the favor of Charles XII. availed him much. "I have invited your enemies to send their united complaints against you, to me," said King Charles to him, "but they dare not do so." Indeed, his life was so blameless; his willingness to have his peculiar views investigated so entire; his reason upon all other subjects so well balanced, that even his bitterest opponents must have regarded him with leniency; for who could sentence to the horrors of a mad-house a man whose only error consisted in a too earnest desire to penetrate those mysteries which the whole world has ever been striving to attain.

Swedenborg was seldom ill, except when he was suffering from what he called his temptations, at which times I

ised all remedies, saying that his pains arose from the
ix of hypocritical spirits. His diet, like that of most
nent men, was simple, and his wants so few as to re-
re only the partial attendance of the gardener and his
, who took charge of his humble residence, and to whom
ave the proceeds of his garden.

Swedenborg never married. Early in life he was attached
he second daughter of his friend Polhem, and they were
othed to each other, a written agreement having been
ed by both. The engagement, however, was so repug-
t to the lady, who was scarcely fourteen years of age,
; her brother, having compassion on her dejection, secret-
estroyed the written compact. No sooner did Sweden-
g realize the condition of his young friend's affections,
a he manfully withdrew his attentions, although he al-
s continued to regard her with great tenderness. Among
pleasing phases of his aberrations was that of frequently
muning with her in the spirit, as he himself assured her
ghters and sons-in-law.

His manner was unassuming, frank, and cordial. Stran-
approached him readily. But he was slow of speech,
oderate alms-giver, took a great deal of snuff, and some-
es went abroad with one shoe-buckle of plain silver,
other set in precious stones. He was a good linguist,
aking several languages fluently, the Hebrew being ac-
red after his illumination in order to perfect his biblical
earches. Four editions of the Bible in Hebrew were
nd in his possession after his death, one of which, pub-
ed in Leipsic in 1740, was given to Rev. Mr. Fernelius,
Schofde, for interring him at London, where he was then
ister to the Swedish chapel. Previous to his death he
attacked with a kind of paralytic stroke, while lodging
h Mr. Thearsmith, a barber, residing in Bath street, Lon-
. The maid who attended him during his last illness
ified to his extreme good nature, adding, that after fore-
ing the hour of his death, "he was so happy!" and
nguage failed her to express this happiness more appro-
tely, she compared it to her own in anticipation of a
day or merry-making. In the immediate presence of
h, he earnestly protested the truth of all he had seen
written. He died March 29, 1772, being eighty-four
s of age. By order of Mr. Lendegren, a Swedish mer-
it, he was laid in state at an undertaker's, and deposited
ree coffins, in the vault of the Swedish church in Prince's

Square, Radcliffe Highway, with all the ceremonies of that church.

The works of Swebenborg, which are exclusively devoted to unfolding the doctrines of the new dispensation, amount to about twenty-seven volumes, octavo, of five hundred pages each, besides some half dozen volumes in manuscript, which seem to have been intended for his own use. These may properly be divided into doctrinal, metaphysical, and those which unfold the spiritual sense of the Scriptures, together with the nature and appearances of the spiritual world and the state of man after death.

The most prominent and distinctive feature of the New Church doctrines, as taught by Swedenborg, consists in supposing the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to exist in the person of Jesus Christ, corresponding to the threefold principle of soul, body, and their operation in man. This view of the trinity differs so essentially from that held by all other churches, that its acceptance necessarily revolutionizes the entire faith of such Christians as accept it. "It is," says Swedenborg, "an error to address God the Father, and to supplicate him to have mercy for the sake of his Son, and to send his Holy Spirit. This mode of supplication is directly contrary to the truth; for the truth teaches us to address the Lord alone, in whom dwelleth the Father, and through whom only can the Father be approached." *

The doctrine of regeneration is also entirely different from that accepted by others. In the New Church, regeneration is considered progressive, commencing in infancy and continuing into eternity. There is supposed also to be an actual correspondence between the spiritual birth and growth and the natural birth and growth of man. Baptism signifies regeneration; while in the Holy Supper the bread and wine represent the good of love and the truths of faith from the Lord. Evil, according to Swedenborg, had its origin in man, and was never created by God.

The doctrine of salvation through faith is also rejected by Swedenborg, either with good works or without them; and he insists that "not a single writer on theology has ever yet found the connection which this faith has with good works." But he believes and asserts, "that the truths which are called the truths of faith teach us how we ought to think of God, and how we ought to act towards our neighbor; and

* Swedenborg's letter to Dr. Menunder, Archbishop of Sweden.

hat charity receives these truths in good work, as the fruit eceives the sap and juices of the tree."

The peculiar language employed by Swedenborg to ex-ress his ideas often renders the meaning obscure, and, con-equently, less attractive to the reader; but as one becomes amiliar with his writings, these Swedenborgisms are found o convey the idea better than any other, and it would be xtremely difficult to substitute the usual mode of expres-ion in their stead. With all his tedious minuteness of detail, hich renders a patient perusal of his theological works an Herculean labor, he who reads them will be rewarded with 'apples of gold and pictures of silver." Whether or not we ccept his delineations and illuminations as from heaven, we annot but feel that, as a man, a friend, and a Christian, he s a worthy example to many who condemn him; while entally, whether sane or insane, he knew by intuition ore than most of us can ever hope to attain by the most areful culture. The impression that Swedenborg is in-ebted for his fame to his illuminations does him injustice; as it not rather the illuminations that were perpetuated hrough the genius of this extraordinary man? Although, n this age of absurdities, it ill becomes us to allude to the eaknesses of others, it should, in justice to Swedenborg, e borne in mind, that he lived in a country and at a time hen a belief in the supernatural existed the world over; nd that the peculiar phases of insanity were not then, as ow, known to constitute the most intricate and subtle of all ental phenomena—the outline between reason throned and ason dethroned being often so indefinitely defined as to affle the ingenuity of the most skilful physician to discover . We recall with shame, that, within the very precincts of lymouth Rock, the insane were tortured as witches and ang as wizards. It does not follow, therefore, that because wedenborg's idiosyncrasy led him to pry too keenly into he secrets of the unknown world, that he discovered no ew truths in regard to it, or that, in all other respects, he as not, both morally and mentally, all that his warmest dmirers claim him to have been. Happy, at least, will it e for his friends or enemies, if, when a century has rolled er their sleeping ashes, their laurels shall be as green— eir weaknesses remembered as so few, and their virtues so any.

ART. IX.—NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

HISTORY AND EDUCATION.

The Life, Intellectual and Æsthetic, of the Ancient Greeks; an Or
By HENRY GILES, Esq. Delivered before the B. J. F. Society,
Annual Commencement of the College of the Holy Cross, Wor
Mass., July 6, 1864. Worcester: Adams & Brown, 1865.

OF the many lectures that have reached our table in pamphlet during the last five years, we have only noticed one. This impl unfavorable estimate on our part of that style of intellectual effort, is one which we did not form hastily, or even willingly; it was the of many disappointments which were too suggestive of the new bea "Blessed are they that expect nothing"—from our lecturers. B name of the institution on the title page of that before us led us to something better than an ordinary performance—an expectation was not at all weakened by the character of the lecturer, who, we ha son to believe, was one of the best in the country. We resolved, the to examine it, although it did not reach us until we were sending th pages of our present number to the press. We find we were right suming that it is far superior to the general class of lectures or es of the present day; but it falls far short of the standard of the coll which it was delivered. It contains some striking thoughts and ex suggestions; but as a whole, it does not do justice to the subject. part which relates to the Athenians would do very well even for th sic atmosphere of the Holy Cross, so far as the facts which it em are concerned, although the form in which those facts are given mi much improved. But nothing could be more erroneous than the lect views on the Spartans, and their civilization. It is true that he i peculiar in entertaining them; on the contrary, fifty have the same pression of the Spartans for every one who differs with him. Bu majority are those who derive their opinions from hearsay; from who judge from what they see on the outside without trouble. The mi are those who trace results to their causes, and ask themselves are a facts consistent with certain theories. Now there is not one of the class, to whom belong several of the reverend professors at Worcester would agree with Mr. Giles in his estimate of Spartan civilizatio order to justify this remark it will be necessary to give an idea of the lecturer says on the subject:

"Two tribes of this race are historically the most distinguished—the and the Ionic—but to follow the fortunes even of these two tribes, thei the most cursory manner, would here be impossible. We can narrow down into the two States which stand respectively at the head of each— and Athens—Sparta the head of the Doric, and Athens the head of the but then we have before us *not resemblance, but contrast.* If we take a comprehensive type of the Greek mind, *we must of necessity* emb

r; for no remarks which will apply extensively to both will have any defi-
ness. Which, then, shall we take—the man of Sparta, or the man of
ens? Which best represents Greek feeling, Greek thought, Greek man-
—which, in short, best represents the totality of Greek character and Greek
? The man of Sparta was trained under such a peculiar system of discipline,
his polity was so in harmony with his training, that he was exceptional not
to the whole Hellenic aggregate, but to his own special tribe; and he was
ly more fit to stand for all Dorians, than he was for all Greeks. He had in
, indeed, the Greek nature. No training could utterly destroy *that*. While
Greek nature lived in him he could not be utterly dead to art. He was,
efore, strongly susceptible to poetry and music; and this susceptibility his
ning did not aim to crush, because song and tune could always minister to
like passion. He was sensitive to poetry, but it was the battle-ode that
ed him; he was sensitive to music, but it was not the gentle Lydian mea-
that he loved, but the Phrygian wildly strong, or the Dorian sedately
re; and to these, as the occasion called, he moved in the war-line march,
religious dance, or the social procession. But even in the limited degree to
ch he was susceptible of song and music, he had no singers and no players
is own. Tyrtæus, the greatest of his lyrists, was of Attica; and Terpander,
ity on the harp, was a Lesbian. The man of Sparta was firm, brave, pa-
t, abstinent; but, also, he was formal, rigid, obstinate, *coarse, and*
. His destiny was military; he was born to be a soldier, and everything
done to make him perfect for his calling. *His education was only drill*;
ating was in mess; *in the ranks alone he was at ease;* and until he was in
he had not his proper business. *Children to him were merely an accident; a*
he had simply upon sufferance; a home was *his* scarcely even by name; the
taneous individual was lost in the political organization, and the free hu-
agent was moulded *into the mechanical State instrument.* The Spartan was re-
ed and grave. He was silent—not altogether because he was cautious in
xpression of opinions, but rather that he had no opinions to express. *He*
no voice in politics; he had no public discussion; no clamors were heard in
assemblies; he had no wrangling, but also, he had no oratory; all political
tions were settled *by the few in dumbness and seclusion.* The Spartan, thus
in his own State, *was repulsive to all beyond it;* he was inhospitable to stran-
, and abhorrent of novelty. To whatever is here implied of good or evil,
character of the Athenian is opposed."

ll this seems plausible enough at first view, but it grossly misrepresents
Spartans, especially in those remarks which we have marked in italics.
at the whole passage means is simply this, that the Spartans were a
itary people, and nothing more. They had no education, no culture,
taste, further than those qualities may be said to belong to a
lier. The Athenians had everything that was great and good, the
rtans everything that was vulgar, coarse, brutal! Our readers well know
none admire the Athenians more than we; but we do not think that
rder to praise them to the full extent of their deserts, as the most
ly cultivated people of all antiquity, it is necessary to degrade the
rtans to the condition of savages. This is not the way to glorify the
enians, since the most thoughtless might ask, If the Athenians were so
, and the Spartans so mean, how did it happen that the latter sucess-
rivalled the former as a nation, even in the time of Pericles? Nay, why
they maintain their ascendency in Greece for nearly a thousand years?
ir having done so consistent with the theory of their being an igno
and thoughtless people? The difficulty of answering these questions
e increased rather than diminished by a glance at the situations of the

rival cities. Athens, so near the Ægean, connected with it by impregnable ramparts, had many advantages as a capital over Sparta, situated far in the interior on the Eurotas, which, except from the fame it has thus acquired, hardly deserves to be called a river. But what was the cause of the Peloponnesian war? Was it not the jealousy of Athens at the superiority of Sparta? For eight-and-twenty years this war continued; almost every State in Greece took part in the struggle on one side or the other; and finally the Spartans were triumphant.

Now, if the Spartans were so remarkably repulsive a people as the lecturer represents them, how did it happen that they got more to assist them than their rivals? The answer perhaps will be that the Spartan's "destiny was military," that "his education was only drill," that "he was born to be a soldier," &c. But this, we must say, is only the superficial view of the case; by no means the true one. Instead of being what they are represented by the lecturer, no nation of any age paid more attention to education than the Spartans. This is the testimony of all writers who have made the subject their study. "The constitution" (of the Spartan States) says Müller, "was formed for the education *as well of the old as the young;* and in the Doric States education was, upon the whole, a subject of *greater importance than government.*"*

In these two remarks allusion is made to the Spartan habit established by Lycurgus, of teaching strangers how to reason, read, write, compute, &c., before instructing them in politics. Even the Athenians, who were their rivals, admit that they paid great attention to the cultivation of the mind. It will be admitted, for example, that Aristotle ought to be a good authority on the subject, but what does the Stagyrite say of Spartan coarseness and ignorance? In discussing the subject of education as essential to the greatness of a State, he remarks that "as there is one end in view in every city, it is evident that education ought to be one and the same in all; and that this should be a common care, and not that of each individual, as it is now, where every one takes care of his own children separately, and each parent in private teaches them as he pleases, but the training of what belongs to all ought to be in common. * * * And for this the Lacedæmonians may *be praised, for they give the greatest attention to education,* and they make it public."†

This, we think, is abundantly plain; still plainer, if possible, is Xenophon, another Athenian, in his Polity of the Lacedæmonians. He tells us that no nation of any age had more excellent advantages for securing the best instruction. If it be urged in reply to this that the historian only means military education, then we can turn to the pages of Plato, yet another Athenian, who explains the whole secret of such

* Dorians, vol. ii., book iii., chap. i.
† Aristotle's Politics, book viii., chap. i.

views as those of the lecturer. By the mouth of Socrates he tells us that the Spartans were not loud talkers, but that they were deep thinkers; that if they were not fond of display they did not the less appreciate what was solid, good, and useful in the productions of the intellect. In short, he tells us the reverse of what the lecturer has told one of the most learned college societies on this continent, but what we are sure that society did not accept as correct. The remarks to which we allude occur in the dialogue of the philosopher with Protagoras, from which we extract the following passage:

"I will endeavor, then," said I, "to explain to you what I think of this ode. Philosophy is most ancient and most prevalent in Crete and *Lacedæmon* of all Greece, and sophists are more numerous there than anywhere else. They deny it, however, and *pretend to be ignorant*, in order that they may not be discovered *to surpass the rest of the Greeks in wisdom*, like those sophists whom Protagoras mentioned, but that they *may appear* to excel in fighting and courage, thinking that, if it were known in what they excel, all men would engage in the same pursuit. But now, concealing this, they deceive those who affect Spartan manners in other cities, for some, in imitation of them, have their ears bruised, and bind their arms with the thongs of the cestus, and devote themselves to gymnastic exercises, and wear short garments, *as if in these things the Lacedæmonians excelled the other Greeks*. But the Lacedæmonians, now that they wish to converse without restraint with the sophists among them, and are wearied with conversing with them in secret, expelling these imitators of Spartan manners, and any other stranger that is living in their country, converse with the sophists *unknown to all strangers;* and they do not suffer any of their young men to go out to other cities, as neither do the Cretans, lest they should unlearn what they have taught them. And in these cities there are not only men *that pride themselves on their learning, but women also*. And you may know that in this I speak truly, and that the Lacedæmonians *are admirably instructed in philosophy and the art of speaking*, from the following circumstance: for if any one wishes to converse with the meanest of the Lacedæmonians, he will find him, for the most part, *apparently* an ordinary person in conversation, but afterwards, *when a proper opportunity presents itself*, he sends forth, like a skilful lancer, *a notable saying, brief and pointed*, so that he who converses with him *will appear to be nothing better than a boy*.

"Accordingly, some persons, both of the present day and of former times, have observed this very thing, that to imitate Spartan manners consists *much more in studying philosophy than devoting one's self to gymnastic exercises*, since they know that to be able to utter such sayings is a *proof of a highly educated man*. Among these were Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mitylene, Bias of Priene, our own Solon, Cleobulus of Lindus, Myson of Chene, and the seventh among them was reckoned the Lacedæmonian Chilo. *These all were emulators, lovers, and disciples of the Lacedæmonian education*, and any one may discover that their wisdom was of this kind, brief and *memorable sayings* uttered by each of them. These men also, having met together, consecrated the first-fruits of their wisdom to Apollo in the temple at Delphi, inscribing those sentences which all men have in their mouths: 'Know thyself,' and 'Nothing in extremes.'"—*Plato's Protagoras, or the Sophists.*

Another serious error on the part of the lecturer, is to regard Sparta as a despotism. It is as great a mistake to think that the Spartan "had no voice in politics" as that "he had no opinions to express." We can well imagine how the learned professors looked when such statements were made to their students, in their presence, well aware as they were that although Sparta was nominally a kingdom, its kings had far less power

than our modern presidents. Two of them reigned together, if, ind men who had to swear obedience to the laws every month coul said to reign. In time of war they commanded the troops alternat but in time of peace their chief prerogative was to preside in the se and propose the subjects for deliberation.*

There were twenty-eight senators, each of whom had the right of ing with the two kings; nor were they obliged to render any accoun either of their manner of discharging their duties. There were, besi five Ephori, who had an oversight of the whole State, and whose d required them to *assert the rights of the people against the kings;* w is more, they were chosen from among the people, and without referenc condition. There were different other classes of magistrates, in wh selection the people had a voice. In addition to all this, there were semblies (*ecclesia*) of the people exactly similar to those at Athens, corresponding with modern parliaments. For a time, the kings had privilege of convening the assemblies, but it was taken out of th hands, and conferred on the Ephori, who also presided in them. Ev citizen capable of bearing arms had the right to appear in the assem and if above thirty years, he had the right to speak and vote. E foreigners were allowed these privileges under certain restrictions. H then, can it be said that the Spartan "had no voice in politics?" tha was nothing more than a "mechanical state instrument?" †

The truth is, then, that the Spartans had quite as much national lib as the Athenians. Now let us consider for a moment the charge of cr ness and cruelty preferred against the Spartans, as compared with Athenians, in the passage we have quoted from the oration before There seems to be no doubt that they treated their slaves very cru but it is equally certain, according to the best authorities, that cruelty in this respect has been greatly exaggerated by their ene Plutarch, who is always moderate, and, as far as possible, accurate i statements, tells us that "it was in after times these cruelties took among the Lacedæmonians; chiefly after the great earthquake, wh history informs us, the *helotes* (slaves), *joining the Messenians*, atta them, did infinite damage to the country, and brought the city t greatest extremity."‡ But assuming that the worst alleged agains Spartans in this respect is true, were they more "cruel" or more "cr than the Athenians, who put to death their greatest men? Was it w to hunt slaves and kill them than to execute the six victorious Ath generals, and to poison men like Socrates and Phocion? In what the contrast consist here? But supposing the Athenians did nothing to banish men like Aristides, Themistocles, Cymon, and Alcibiad

* Müller, vol. ii., p. 106.

† See Robinson's Archæol. Græc., p. 172; also Xenophon on the Polity o Lacedæmonians; Thuc. i, 134, &c.

‡ Life of Lycurgus.

could hardly be said that they were very just, upright, and enlightened, as compared to the Spartans, who treated their great men, especially their philosophers, in a very different way. During their lives they rewarded them handsomely for their services, and, after their death, they honored their memory with cenotaphs, statues, and other monuments. If there be a contrast, then, it is hardly in favor of the Athenian, of whom the lecturer says: "Genius in him had no restraint." We ask did Socrates or Anaxagoras experience no restraint? Were not both, on the contrary, always under restraint, as much as minds like theirs were capable of being acted upon by threats of violence, or the fear of death? But, with this exception, if the lecturer entirely misrepresents the Spartan, as we have shown, he does no more than justice to the Athenian. We are far more disposed to speak of the lecturer's merits than of his defects, although we could not but protest against his misrepresenting the Spartans in so Grecian an atmosphere as that of Holy Cross College, and, accordingly, we allow him to appear before our readers in a more favorable light by extracting a part of his description of the Athenian, only premising that even in this he continues to give an occasional thrust to the Spartan:

"He was courageous, and he was a soldier; but courage was one only of his qualities, and a soldier only one of his offices. His education was as diversified as the capabilities of his nature, and these were as many as humanity could seem to hold. He was subject to the State, but not lost in it; he was in the State, not as a disposable atom, but as a conscious and vital part. He was gay, versatile, talkative, and impressible—declamatory, subtle, logical, argumentative; he insisted on open discussion—put everything to the vote; delighted in eloquence; required patriots and demagogues, philosophers and sophists, dramas and festivals, as necessaries of existence. He gave welcome to visitors, was hospitable to strangers, sought for news with avidity, and was ready to examine or entertain any original tenet or theory. The Athenian, therefore, is not, as the Spartan, exceptional or exclusive, but comprehensive and liberal. Ionic — as mainly he was, he had more of the Doric in him than the Spartan had —because, he was more deeply and more widely Greek. His discipline did not blunt, but sharpen his instincts; his institutions did not suppress, but bring out his faculties; and as in all these he was eminently Hellenic, his culture, the most perfect known to Greece, made him the most complete type of his concrete nationality. For these reasons, in conceiving an idea of Greek life, I think of it principally, though not entirely, in the Athenian form of it. The fulness of Greek culture stands alone in the experience of the world. History has nothing else like it. Independent and complete, it rejoices in its own sufficiency. The Greek idea of life sought for strength and harmony of body as well as for strength and harmony of mind; sought for the equilibrium of both sets of forces in accordant reciprocity and sympathy of action. The Greek was, therefore, a balanced man; a man fairly and finely ordered, I mean, for earth and time. He abhorred excess and disproportion. All the most cultivated aspirations of his being sought for tranquillity. The most tragic dramatist risked his success by a certain intensity; and if he excited an emotion too severely painful he was in danger with his audience. But the tranquillity for which the Greek sought was not that of a dormant condition, it was that of a complete replenishment. The desire for a vital calmness was an inward principle of Greek life; and through this inward principle we can understand Greek life in its formation and its growth. Under this law, Greek life was humanity unfolding itself fully *in* the human and *for* the human. It cultivated itself in all directions, in every energy, in every capacity. Culture *by* the senses—culture *for* the

senses, had only in the Greek a true and well adjusted order. And the culture of the soul, so far as the fit and the fair were concerned, kept pace with the culture of the senses. We find in no other man as in the Greek, the soul *so in* the senses, and the senses so in the soul. The Greek materialized spirit; he spiritualized matter; he *hummized* all things. Conceive yourself in Greece before the Hellenic spirit awoke upon its soil. The stars above it are bright; but with a brightness that is yet lonely. The waves beat inarticulately upon its shores; the streams have yet no meaning. Its woods and glens are mindless. The marble yet sleeps unshaped beneath the surface. *The gods are not yet known.* And heavens, and sky, and sea, and air, and woods, and rivers, are waiting with unconscious glory for the population of divinities. The thunders of Olympus are yet to be inspired by the soul of Zeus—and the vacant rock of the Acropolis waits for the presence of Athena. The land was desolate and savage; it was not yet vivified with wisdom, and song, and eloquence, and arts, and arms, and laws, and letters. But soon a wonderful spirit began to work: a spirit of mystic instinct—plastic to mould and active to inspire; then *dead* matter breathed into life, and *formless* matter sprung into beauty. Streams, woods, waves, stars, were crowded with divine inhabitants; and every stir and every sound in nature became the motion or the voice of some invisible power. Then the marble which lay unshapely in the womb of earth was born into living loveliness; at the bidding of genius, it arose to fair and sublime existence; and the stately temple crowned the hill, and the glowing statue gave lustre to the temple. The Greek eye was the poetry of sight; the Greek ear was the poetry of hearing; even Greek appetite sought for grace; and Greek taste was shocked at whatever was convulsive or intemperate."—pp. 5, 6.

Further on the lecturer returns again to his favorite contrast. It is principally in view of what he says here that we have glanced at the political system of Sparta. The lecturer takes it for granted that it is a despotism, and then institutes a comparison between rival States, as follows:

"Despotism may give instruction, but it cannot give impulse; it may teach, but it cannot inspire: it may communicate knowledge, but it imparts no life. Its training is hard, military, and mechanical. The institutions and social agencies which throw men upon themselves, or which bring them into contact with each other, are rare means of intellectual enlargement and enlightenment. Books, sciences, and arts, when they have done their utmost, *may, after all, give a man nothing but the education of a slave;* and as regards all that befits a free intelligence, as regards all the generous uses of the soul, they may leave him imbecile or helpless. In our modern civilization, the man who has trial by jury, and has had it long; who has representative government, with all its machineries of administrations and parties; who has been habituated all his life to unrestrained opinion and uncowering speech; who has sharpened his mind and strengthened his faculties, and enlarged his views, in consultation or controversy with others; who finds for himself, or has forced upon him, activities that engage his thoughts, his anxieties, his charities, and his zeal; who has the *consciousness* that what concerns the State concerns him also; that what is important to the common good is likewise important to individual duty if not to individual interest; that in the general risk he has personal danger; that whether he has or not he ought not to be indifferent; the man, I say, who lives in a social atmosphere such as this, in its quick, constant, unimpeded circulation of ideas, feelings, passions, has culture better than all the scholastic teaching which despotism can offer; a culture which is not merely political, but one which is in many ways practical; a culture that imparts a large amount of knowledge incidentally, and imparts along with it a sagacity and experience which are of more account in the affairs of life, as well as the affairs of nations, than any measure of abstract acquisition. The free citizen of a free State has, therefore, a training of special nobleness, and within the mere action of the State."—p. 10.

n our opinion, whatever gives instruction gives impulse. Knowledge ower in despotisms just as much as it is in republics; and if we exam- the roll of fame we shall find, with the sole exception of Athens, that spotisms have produced at least as great geniuses as republics; gener- y much greater. Be it remembered that some of the world's greatest tellects were even slaves. The divine Plato himself was once sold into very. Pythagoras, the most illustrious of instructors, was born and ought up under a despotism; the same is true of Thales of Miletus, e of the seven wise men of Greece. The political system under which sar, Cicero, Sallust, and Livy were educated was nominally a repub- , but really a despotism. Both really and nominally that under which rgil and Horace were educated was a despotism; but did they prove e less immortal on this account? or were they equalled, much less ex- lled, by any poet of republican times? Nor will the results be found ferent if we compare modern republics with modern despotisms. Who e the great men, for example, of the republics of the Middle Ages who cel those of the despotisms of the same period? Has Venice produced e superior, or the equal of Dante, or Tasso; both of whom suffered op- ession for most of their lives? Was the Dutch republic more fruitful great geniuses than the despotism of France? At no time did the vereign enjoy more unlimited power in the latter country than in the ign of Louis the Fourteenth; but was not this the Augustan age of ench intellect? Nor can it be said that there has been a different ex- rience in the New World. Our own republic has produced some great inkers, it is true; but are they greater than those produced in monarch- al or despotic countries within the same period?—greater, for example, an Frenchmen, Prussians, Austrians, or even Swedes? But we must ake room for yet another extract from the pamphlet before us. The one e have marked for that purpose is long, but it is good in proportion. e wish to show the author that it is in no unfriendly spirit we have iticised some of his views; we also wish to show the reader that, not- ithstanding the errors we have pointed out, the Oration on the Ancient reeks is, as we have said, no ordinary lecture; and that, although we annot think it reaches the standard of the institution at which it was de- ered it still possesses merit of a high order. In short, we do not sitate to forgive the lecturer even for the gross injustice he has done e Spartans, in consideration of the following peroration, with which we ke leave of the subject for the present:

"What, then, was that which Greece had, and which eternalized her influ- ce? Ideas, sentiments, genius—ideas shaping themselves into institutions— nt sentiments going forth into great actions—genius transcending both— ich carried them onward with its own life, and wrapped them in the halo of r own splendor. The governing ideas of Greece were those of intelligence d freedom; the ruling sentiments were attachment to country, devotion to ws, and admiration of intellect. Intelligence formed for itself academies and ums, theatres and schools. Freedom made for itself popular political insti-

tutions. Attachment to country made patriotism a passion; devotion to th State showed itself not less in obedience to its laws than in bravery for its d fence; admiration of intellect did homage to the spirit of philosophy, and a tracted eager disciples to the teachings of its sages. Thus it is that all whic Greece was, and all which Greece did, was full of import. Persia had space an had multitudes, but the world feels from it now no living power. Carthage ha wealth; but when Carthage was conquered, Carthage expired. There natio fought mighty battles; but all battles which do not connect themselves wi noble principles appear in history only as pugnacious butcheries. A victo has no merit but when it vindicates a cause which impartial generations w applaud. To boast of victory for mere strength is the insolence of a bull; and to exult in it for spoil is the rejoicing of a robber. But not such were t gloryings for the victories of Marathon and Salamis. They were victori gained with no splendid armaments, with no rapacity, with no pride of ter tory; they were gained in the assertion of heroic manhood; they made go the claims of independent nationality; they illustrated principles which are deep as nature; and they had a spirit in them to which all humanity respon And yet what would the whole be, of this Greek mind and this Greek li without the genius which was in it!—the genius which has survived its insti tions and its actions? It is by Grecian genius in Grecian literature that have the wisdom of Plato, of Socrates, and of Aristotle; that we have t poetry of Æschylus and Homer; that we have the patriotism of Leonidas; th we have the eloquence of Demosthenes; that we have, in fact, *the soul* of gre institutions and the substance of high deeds. There is a life, I admit, which more lasting than genius—it is that of right! There is a sentiment which more generous than patriotism—it is that of humanity; and I do not say th Greece had in any supreme force this moral enlightenment, and this philanthro enlargement. I speak of Greece but as compared with the rest of ancient n tions; nations which had other kinds of ambition and other estimates of glo When Pericles in the age of Athenian greatness pronounced the funeral oration those who fell in the first year of the Peloponnesian war, he did not glory Athens so much for empire, for multitudes, or for riches, as he did in h humane tendencies, in her cultivated tastes, and in her intellectual spi When Demosthenes, in the hour of adversity, uttered his eulogies on those w were slain at Cheronea, he did not droop in his eloquence, nor despond; h arose to the grandeur of his genius, in praising the majesty of duty, which fatality of result can criminate, and which no potency of external force can co quer. All this mind, all this life, has inspiring perpetuity in Grecian literatu and through that literature they penetrate the mind and life of the wor *Those who teach us rule us;* and when they do not rule us by direct communi they rule us by intermediate influence; they rule us in the very source of t thought and conduct; and when all other power has crumbled this is still u weakened. Such a sway has been and is that of Greece in the concerns humanity—a most exalted, a most sovereign sway. Military empire is b splendid materialism; mere multitudes are but physical; all that they c achieve is transient; it is *soul* only that is *immortal; immortal* in the individu *immortal* in the nations."

St. Winifred's; or, The World of School. 12mo., pp. 411. New Yor W. H. Kelly & Brother, 1865.

THE design of this work is to illustrate school life at the princi high schools of England; and it will be seen that the design is well c ried out. Only one school is mentioned, but that is to be regarded as t type of a class. To this we need hardly add that it is on the plan "School Days at Rugby;" nor is it unworthy of comparison with t favorite work. The author evidently understands his subject. He kn not only how boys behave at school, when no longer under the supe

ir parents; he also knows how they are treated by their teach-
e has the faculty of presenting his views in a forcible light. His
f the sports of the boys are lively and graphic, and they bear
s of truth. The same remark will apply to their conduct towards
r, and to that of the majority towards the new students.
rho have ever been at a large school away from home can fail to
ed by these portraitures, recalling, as they do, even to the oldest
houghtless, many a familiar face, many a happy moment. Yet it
this feature, strongly marked as it is, that we like *St. Winifred's*
for the judicious views it gives us of the system of teaching and
practised at those famous high schools. The author has no dis-
depreciate the value of the schools *per se*; what he desires to
w much more good they might be made to accomplish than they
a system different from that which now prevails, or at least
prevail not very long since. He places in relief the absurdity
achers who would govern all students by the same rules, with-
gard to their disposition, temperament, or natural ability; and
e reader to realize the consequences of such a course, without
him with any abstract reasoning.
ton is a teacher of this class; one who does everything by rule
tomaton, and who is unconscious of any better inducement to
punishment. His idea of developing the human mind is, that the
ust perform a certain amount of labor in a certain time—he must
memory a certain number of rules; and if he fails in this, he
the penalty in one form or other. First, he is detained
fellow students, and required to perform a double amount of
ter two or three failures of this kind, for each of which
en punished already but too severely, he is sent to the head
be "caned;" nor does the latter fail to do his part of the work,
his usher may do the same occasionally.
berston is another teacher who has strong faith in the virtue
l punishment as a means of brightening the intellectual faculties;
difference between him and Paton, in this respect, is that he has
d nature, or rather less ill nature, than his colleague. He thinks
nt an excellent agency in education; but sometimes his heart
in inflicting it on a good-natured boy whose only real crime is that
rly unable to perform, within the prescribed period, the amount
required. Mr. Percival is a tutor of another character; he has
ning as well as more talent than both his colleagues, and he is
lgent in proportion—that is, he is, in a word, more thoughtful,
losophical. Some idea may be formed of the relative characters of
tutors by a remark or two from each. "Why, what's the matter
Paton?" asked Mr. Roberston.* * * "No, said Mr. Paton,
e just been caning Evson, a new boy, and the fellow's stubborn

obstinacy and unaccountable coolness annoy me exceedingly." "Oh, yes, he is a pupil of mine, I am sorry to say, and he has never been free from punishment since he came. Even your Procrustean rule seems to fail with him, Paton. What have you been obliged to cane him for?" (p. 56).

While the two champions of the ferula are thus discussing the shortcomings of Walter Evson, (who, be it remembered, is the hero of the story) they are overheard by Mr. Percival, who remarks: "Excuse me; I humbly venture to think that you are both mistaken in that boy. I like him exceedingly, and think him as promising a lad as any in the school. I never knew any boy behave more modestly or respectfully. "Why, how do you know anything of him?" asked Mr. Roberston, in surprise. "Only by accident. I had once or twice noticed him with the *detenus*, and being sorry to think that a new boy should be a *habitué* of the extra school-room, I asked him one day why he was. He told me that it was for failing in a lesson; and when I asked why he hadn't it, he said very simply and respectfully, 'I really did my very best, sir, but its all new work to me.' Look at the boy's innocent, engaging face, and you will be sure that he was telling me the truth." (p. 57). Mr. Percival had not confined himself to merely asking a question and observing the honest simplicity of the reply; he had invited the alleged transgressor to take a walk with him; and now he tells the result, as follows: "Do you know, I never found a more intelligent companion. He was all life and vivacity, and it was quite a pleasure to be with him." (*Ib.*)

It is hardly necessary to say that these few judicious and timely remarks had the greatest influence on the fortune of Walter Evson. Even Paton could not help being influenced by them in his future treatment of the boy. Both the champions of rules and of the ferula always wondered at the success of Percival in making what they regarded bad boys good, and they now want to know its secret. His reply is this: "Try a little kindness and sympathy. I have no other secret." (p. 58.) This, with the necessary ability in other respects, rarely fails to render study attractive rather than irksome even to students who are naturally indolent. But all does not save Evson from future canings. A paragraph on the next page concludes as follows: "Yet Dr. Lane (the head master) had in this case no alternative but the infliction of corporal punishment." Nor does the author forget to tell us what was the immediate effect. "*Humiliated* again," he says, "*and full of bitter anger*, Walter returned to the great school-room, where he was received with sympathy and kindness by the others in his class." (p. 59.)

In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred these are the results produced by physical punishment; and perhaps the worst result of all, although the least thought of, is the sympathy felt by the rest of the class with the student on whom the physical infliction has been made. But few are aware how

uch depends on the character of the head master, principal, or president
'a literary institution. Dr. Lane of St. Winifred's is but the type of a class.
e thinks that boys cannot be governed without stripes; and, accordingly,
there be any of his ushers who do not think the same, they must be care-
l in giving expression to their views, like Mr. Percival. That some
od teachers have practised corporal punishment is very true; but this
s their foible; they were good, not because they inflicted corporal
nishment, but in spite of their doing so. In other words, this was a draw-
k on their qualifications as teachers which was counteracted by their
perior learning, their ability to communicate that learning to others.
n of this class have made good scholars; but they would have made
tter, and more of them, had they pursued the milder and more philo-
phical system.

It ought to be needless to remark at the present day that there
s no greater error than to suppose that boys cannot be instructed
vantageously without whips, canes, or other instruments of tor-
e; but there are still some who cling to the ancient faith in stripes
and a much larger number than is generally supposed. It is equally
t needless to say that they are the worst class of teachers, who can-
t depend on the influence of mind upon mind, even in the culture of
e latter. They are but indifferent logicians at best who cannot convince
e general class of boys who attend high schools or colleges without
ating them like brutes; that they think differently themselves, and
l all other systems in contempt, serves rather to establish this fact
an to disprove it, for none admire themselves so much as the most
norant,

"L'ignorance toujours est prête à s'admirer."

We know a president of a college not very far from New York, having
early two hundred students, who never inflicts any corporal punishment,
permits it to be inflicted by others; he does not even hold out the threat
expulsion for bad conduct; yet, never have we seen one who exercises a
more unbounded influence on the students, or who is more readily and cheer-
fully obeyed; never have we visited a more orderly institution, or one in
hich more rapid proficiency is made in every department of knowledge.
ike the disciples of Pythagoras of old, the students say to each other, "The
resident said so," and this is final. What is, perhaps, most worthy of re-
rk is, that it is not arrogant, pretentious, or overbearing men who
e most successful in this very essential part of an educator's duty; but
the contrary, the mildest and most modest. In time Dr. Lane learns
t he has been mistaken in his treatment of at least one student; even
on has to acknowledge that he has done Walter Evson injustice.
en a different course from that described is pursued towards the lat-
he soon proves that he is neither stupid nor vicious, but a youth of
intellect and amiable disposition. The change has an excellent effect

on the whole school; in time his parents are so well pleased wit proficiency he has made that they send his two younger brothers t same institution; nor does our hero leave until he is at the head o class, and consequently entitled to the first open fellowship at the versity. To this we need hardly add, that "St. Winifred's; or, the W of School," is worthy the attention of both teachers and students.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of Am
By ABEL STEVENS, LL. D., author of "The History of the Reli Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism, &c. I. and II., 12mo., pp. 423, 511. New York: Carlton & Porter,

WE confess that in taking up these volumes we did not expect to them very interesting, but we are equally willing to admit that have agreeably disappointed us. It is but fair to say that our wa faith did not arise from any low estimate of the abilities of the au but from the meagerness of his subject, and the fact that most boo the present day treating on religion are exceedingly dull and com place. But Dr. Stevens is a close student; he has the industry an ergy to seek materials wherever they are to be found, and the good and taste to make judicious use of them when found. A writer of kind rarely fails to interest his readers, let his subject be what it Accordingly we are of opinion that the work before us will have re among all denominations, as an interesting contribution to our hist literature.

We do not, indeed, agree with the author in all his views the influence of Methodism; but we are not of those who find no meritorious in any work, the general tone of which conflicts with thei impressions. But there is a good deal that is interesting in the presen umes the truth of which none will dispute. It is our habit when we tak book for review, to make whatever lessons it may teach, whic think of any value, available for our readers as best we can; in words, we do not consider merely the sense in which it has been wr but try to render the experiences which it embodies applicable to cases; to the present and the future as well as to the past; to one par one sect, as the case may be, as well as to another. Thus, for exampl Stevens shows us that the Methodists have been severly persecut other denominations of Protestants. This ought to be a lesson t Methodists in tolerance and moderation towards others who may cate doctrines different from their own. We do not allege that they not profited by it, but rather think that, upon the whole, they are dis to be liberal in this respect. But we will let the author himself gi idea of the character of the work. As we have just been speaking subject of persecution, we may as well give our first extract from h marks on that. After alluding to the rapid spread of Methodis historian observes:

"Chapels rose rapidly in most of the country. Hostilities also arose; mobs killed the itinerants; their chapels were pulled down; for months, and even years, riots were of almost constant occurrence. In some sections the rabble moved in hosts from village to village, attacking preachers and people, destroying not only the churches, but the homes of Methodists. In Staffordshire the whole region was in a state little short of civil war.' In Darlaston, writes Wesley could distinguish the houses of the Methodists by their marks of violence as he rode through the town. At Walsall he found the flag of the mob waving in the market-place, their headquarters. In Lichfield 'all the rabble of the country was gathered together, and laid waste all before them.' The storm swept over nearly all Cornwall. Newcastle was in tumult. In London even occurred formidable mobs. In Cork and Dublin they prevailed almost beyond the control of the magistrates. Methodism had, in fine, to fight its way over nearly every field it entered in Great Britain and Ireland. The clergy and the magistrates were often the instigators of these tumults.* Not a few of the itinerantswe re imprisoned, or impressed into the army and navy; some were martyred. But the devoted sufferers held on their way till they conquered the mob, and led it by thousands to their humble altars."—pp. 41, 42.

Dr. Stevens shows that the Irish had an active and powerful hand in the establishment of Methodism, as well as in many other works, good, bad, and indifferent. He tells us also that Wesley had no mean opinion of the followers of St. Patrick.

"John Wesley appreciated the Irish character in both its virtues and its defects. Ireland was a favorite resort to him; he crossed the channel forty-two times, as we have seen, spending at least six years of his laborious life on the island. Though he was sometimes mobbed, and even hung in effigy, these hostilities were but local, and could not affect his estimate of the people generally. 'They are an immeasurably loving people,' he writes. During a sermon in the open air they would not cover their heads in a hail-storm, though he advised them to do so. 'Indeed, so civil a people as the Irish in general I never saw,' he says, 'either in Europe or America.' As 'perfect courtesy' could be found in their cabins as in the courts of London or Paris. His Irish congregations were generally 'in tears,' but 'the water spread too wide to be deep.' He found it necessary to preach to them with a more alarming tone than he used in any other part of the United Kingdom, in order to make any lasting impression upon their versatile minds. Yet Ireland was to yield him many of the most eminent of his coadjutors: Adam Clarke, Henry Moore, Thomas Walsh, Gideon Ouseley, and scores more. Irishmen were to found Methodism, or aid in founding it, in the North American British Provinces, in the United States, in the West Indies, in Australia, in Africa, in India. 'They sleep in missionary graves, awaiting the trumpet of the resurrection, in nearly all parts of the globe to which Methodism has borne the cross.'"—pp. 47, 48.

We fear there are some of our Methodists who have no friendly feeling towards the Irish, but rather regard them as intruders, if not as enemies alike to religion and free government. If the former would only reflect that those who were the first to introduce their religion into this country came from Ireland they would probably be less disdainful than they are, or more charitable, towards the latter. It will not be the fault of the author of this book, at all events, if the Irish be regarded any longer by

---

"* The contemporary books of Methodism abound in proofs. Buckle says, 'The treatment which the Wesleyans received from the clergy, many of whom were magistrates, shows what would have taken place if such violence had not been discouraged by the government. Wesley himself given many details, which Southey did not think proper to relate, of the calumnies and insults to which he and his followers were subjected by the clergy.'—*History of Civilization*, vol. 1, p. 304."

Methodists with an evil eye. We note this, however, only as an instanc of his liberality and enlightened, conciliatory spirit. The same hones feeling, the same good sense, and the same Christian charity pervade th work, and we repeat that as such it will be generally read.

The American Union Speaker; containing standard and recent selection in Prose and Poetry, for recitation and declamation in Schools, Ac demies, and Colleges, with introductory remarks on Elocution and E planatory Notes. By JOHN D. PHILBRICK, Superintendent of the Publ Schools of Boston. 8vo., pp. 588. Boston: Taggard & Thompso 1865.

THE title of this portly volume gives a correct general idea of its cha acter. There are some of the pieces which do not deserve a place in th book, because it would be injurious rather than advantageous to imitat their style. It is but fair to add, however, that there are fewer such i the present volume than in any other "Speaker" that has recently falle into our hands; and that with these exceptions the selections in genera have been judiciously made. In no department do we see any evidenc of prejudice, whether political, religious, or national. This is as it shoul be; since all parties, denominations, and nationalities may be expected t use an American school book to a greater or less extent. Many of th pieces selected have an appropriate bearing on the present condition o our country. Thus, for example, we have seldom read any chapter wi a more lively interest than we have Andrew Jackson's "Appeal to th Loyalty of South Carolina," in the volume before us. There is genui eloquence in this appeal, but it is the remarkable prophetic spirit whi pervades it that has interested us most. If the South Carolinians wou only read it to-day they might well honor the memory of the man w gave them a warning the startling truthfulness of which they h since but too fully realized.

BELLES-LETTRES.

Enoch Arden. By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet-Laureate. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1865.

ALTHOUGH we cannot agree with the more enthusiastic admirers of Tennyson in their estimate of this poem, there is no lover of poetry to whom we would not recommend its perusal. The author is, indeed, far from being our favorite among English poets; there are at least a dozen whom we prefer to him. This will, perhaps, account for our not having given our impressions of "Enoch Arden" before this. The truth is, that we did not read the poem until lately; and it was rather by accident than design that we took it up a few days since. It would have been very different could we have expected a new poem from Byron, Campbell, Moore, Shelley, or Coleridge. By this we do not mean, however, that we had derived no pleasure from Tennyson before the appearance of his present effort; this would not only be incorrect on our part, but ungrateful, for there are passages in *Maud*, *In Memoriam* and *Idylls of the King*, which have charmed us more than once. What we do mean is, that none of these poems satisfied us as a whole, although we are fully aware that all are admired by men and women of the most refined tastes. Nor can we say that "Enoch Arden" equals our ideal of a modern English poem; nay, we think that each of the poets mentioned has written better, although, perhaps, not one of them has excelled certain passages in the work before us, which are neither few nor brief. And we think that even those who deny this will cheerfully admit that there is no English poem of the same extent that has the advantage of a sadder fable, or one that lays a stronger hold on the sympathies of the reader, not excepting "Gertrude of Wyoming," "O'Conor's Child," or even the story of "Araby's Daughter," as related by the Peri in Lalla Rookh, in strains like the following:

> "The young village maid, when with flowers she dresses
> Her dark flowing hair for some festival day,
> Will think of thy fate, till, neglecting her charms,
> She mournfully turns from her mirror away."

But there is this difference between the stories just mentioned and that of "Enoch Arden:" the former do honor to woman, while if the latter does not, on the contrary, cast a stain upon her, it is at least not creditable to her. In the present instance, it is the man that is glorified. This would be well enough were it not done at the expense of the woman, which was not at all necessary. Yet the portraiture of the heroine is much truer to nature than that of the hero; that is, there are some women who act like Annie, but if there be men who act like Enoch Arden we have never met one of them. In order that those who have not yet read the poem may understand this, it will be necessary to give a brief outline of the fable: Three children, two boys and a girl—namely, Enoch Arden, Philip Ray, and Annie Lee—representing three different families—were

wont to play together. Both boys became so much attached to the girl that they used to cause her to weep by their jealousy. In time, however, Annie evinced an unmistakable preference for Enoch, and as soon as required to do so became his wife. Philip, although somewhat disappointed at finding his rival preferred to himself, took rather a Platonic view of the whole affair, somewhat after the manner of the similar hero in Goethe's "Werther." In due time Enoch Arden has three children, but finding himself too poor to support his family in that comfort which he wishes they should enjoy, he resolves to go to sea. As a matter of course, his wife is opposed to his leaving, but he persuades her to give her consent, and he bids all an affectionate farewell, promising to return as soon as possible. His wife is sorely afflicted, but soon receives consolation from the attentions and generosity of his former rival. The latter commences to evince his kindness by offering to send her children to school at his own expense. Her gratitude for this and other attentions knows no bounds. After her husband is absent some years he proposes marriage to her; she makes a gracious reply, only asking one year more. When the year is expired she is as anxious for the marriage as he, if not a little more so, and soon after they are married accordingly. After they have their first child Enoch Arden comes home an old man, having been shipwrecked and spent several years on a solitary island. On reaching the village he learns all that has happened during his absence, but is so generous that he resolves not to make himself known until his death, lest his beloved wife, now the wife of another, might be made unhappy by such unwelcome news. Working like a common slave for his daily bread, while his wife is in the enjoyment of every luxury that a rich miller can afford her, he ekes out a miserable existence for a few years, and then dies, as much from want of the common necessaries of life as from disease and grief; and all the reward he receives for all this self denial and generosity is a respectable funeral.

In our opinion, they are only mythical sailors who act in this way. A sailor possessed of flesh and blood would be much more likely to follow the example of Ulysses, whose old age and long absence did not prevent him from inflicting such signal chastisement on Penelope's suitors. The hero of the Odyssey acted in strict accordance with human nature in rescuing even the offer of marriage to his wife. If Penelope had pursued the easy, convenient course of Annie, she would never have been immortalized by Homer, who makes a heroine of even Argive Hellen, not as a faithless or inconstant wife, but as the beautiful and amiable victim of force and violence. We should be sorry to regard Annie as a fair specimen of the women of England, and we think it would be a still greater insult to the national character to accept Enoch Arden as a fair type of the British tar. Still we cheerfully forgive Her Majesty's laureate for misrepresenting his countrymen and countrywomen, in consideration of the charming manner

h he does it; and we think our readers will be equally lenient s have furnished them a few passages from the poem. The land- ainter could hardly choose a more gloomy and romantic subject at presented in the opening stanza:

> "Long lines of cliff breaking have left a chasm;'
> And in the chasm are foam and yellow sands;
> Beyond, red roofs about a narrow wharf
> In cluster; then a moulder'd church; and higher
> A long street climbs to one tall-tower'd mill;
> And high in heaven behind it a grey down
> With Danish barrows; and a hazelwood,
> By autumn nutters haunted, flourishes
> Green in a cuplike hollow of the down."—p. 3.

is followed by a graphic account of the sports of the three chil- eir childish quarrels, and their jealousies. Passing over some culiarities which are rather common in Tennyson, we transcribe ing lines in the third stanza as no indifferent specimen of that f poetry:

> "When, if they quarrell'd, Enoch, stronger-made,
> Was master: then would Philip, his blue eyes
> All flooded with the helpless wrath of tears,
> Shriek out 'I hate you, Enoch,' and at this
> The little wife would weep for company,
> And pray them not to quarrel for her sake,
> And say she would be little wife to both."—p. 4.

feeling of Philip on seeing the first proof of the preference of well described in the following passage, although it will be seen somewhat inconsistent with what is subsequently related in the

> "But as he climb'd the hill,
> Just where the prone edge of the wood began
> To feather toward the hollow, saw the pair,
> Enoch and Annie, sitting hand-in-hand,
> His large grey eyes and weather-beaten face
> All-kindled by a still and sacred fire,
> That burn'd as on an altar. Philip look'd,
> And in their eyes and faces read his doom;
> Then, as their faces drew together, groan'd
> And slipt aside, and like a wounded life
> Crept down into the hollows of the wood:
> There, while the rest were loud in merrymaking,
> Had his dark hour unseen, and rose and past
> *Bearing a lifelong hunger in his heart.*"—p. 6.

after, Enoch and Annie are united in marriage, and in due time e three children. But, as already intimated, he is poor, and re- better his fortune. The account we have of his parting with children is full of genuine pathos, but is such that a fragment ll it. We must, therefore, pass on to a passage that is more in itself, and consequently can be more easily separated from xt. Enoch is but a short time gone when one of the children ls affords Philip an opportunity of paying Annie a visit. He r room without much ceremony, places himself by her side, and ducate her children. The poet describes the result as follows:

> "Then Annie, with her brows against the wall,
> Answered, 'I cannot look you in the face;
> I seem so *foolish and so broken down.*

When you came in my sorrow broke me down;
And now I think your kindness breaks me down;
But Enoch lives; that is borne in on me:
He will repay you: money can be repaid;
Not kindness such as yours.'
And Philip ask'd
'Then you will let me, Annie?'
There she turn'd,
She rose, and fixt her swimming eyes upon him,
And dwelt a moment on his kindly face,
Then calling down a blessing on his head
Caught at his hand, and wrung it passionately,
And past into the little garth beyond.
So lifted up in spirit he moved away."—pp. 16, 17.

Some time after, the children want to go nutting to the wood. They ask Philip to accompany them; he consents, on condition that Annie will go also; nor will she refuse. The whole party proceed on the nutting excursion, and we are accordingly presented with some interesting scenes:

"But after scaling half the weary down,
Just where the prone edge of the wood began
To feather toward the hollow, all her force
Fail'd her; and sighing, 'Let me rest,' she said:
So Philip rested with her well-content;
While all the younger ones with jubilant cries
Broke from their elders, and tumultuously
Down thro' the whitening hazels made a plunge
To the bottom, and dispersed, and beat or broke
The lithe reluctant boughs to tear away
Their tawny clusters, crying to each other
And calling, here and there, about the wood."—p. 19.

Annie wants some rest, and Philip an opportunity to say some tender things. After the preliminaries supposed to be usual in such cases, he tells her that he wishes her to be his wife. She receives the proposal in good part, and is rather pleased with the idea that her husband, whose only ambition was to make her happy, is dead. But let the poet tell in his own words how graciously the suitor is treated by the modern Penelope:

"Then answere'd Annie; tenderly she spoke:
'You have been as God's good angel in our house.
God bless you for it, God reward you for it,
Philip, with something happier than myself.
Can one love twice? can you be ever loved
As Enoch was? what is it that you ask?'
'I am content,' he answered, 'to be loved
A little after Enoch.' 'O,' she cried,
Scared as it were, 'dear Philip, wait a while.
If Enoch comes—but Enoch will not come—
Yet wait a year, a year is not so long:
Surely I shall be wiser in a year:
O wait a little!' Philip sadly said,
'Annie, as I have waited all my life
I well may wait a little.' 'Nay,' she cried,
'I am bound: you have my promise—in a year:
Will you not bide your year as I bide mine?'
And Philip answer'd, 'I will bide my year.'—p. 21.

This was a pretty easy way to dispose of the rights of poor Enoch. After they leave the wood, Philip wishes to show his beloved that he desires to take no advantage of vows or promises made at a tender moment:

"'Annie, when I spoke to you,
That was your hour of weakness. I was wrong.
I am always bound to you, but you are free.'"—p. 22.

The loving and faithful Annie would not agree to this, for the poet tells us,

"Then Annie, weeping, answered 'I am bound.'"—p. 22.

After the year is passed, Annie is quite as anxious as Philip to get married, although she modestly asks another month in order to be quite sure that Enoch will never return. To satisfy herself on this point, she prays earnestly for a sign; she starts out of bed in the dead of night, seizes "the Holy Book" so as to get her finger on a text which will enlighten her on the all-important subject. In this pious manner she satisfies her conscience, and the marriage takes place; and in the very same stanza in which the merry event is chronicled, the poet accounts as follows for certain apprehensions occasionally entertained by Annie:

"Such doubts and fears were common to her state,
Being with child: but when her child was born,
Then her new child was as herself renew'd.
Then the new mother came about her heart,
Then her good Philip was her all-in-all,
And that mysterious instinct wholly died."—p. 25.

A poet having any regard for the unities would have allowed his heroine at least seven months to get into the interesting state here described; but not a week is allowed by Tennyson. Horace, it is true, lays great stress on the importance of entering at once *in medias res;* but it may be doubted whether he meant to encourage quite so much abruptness, especially in delicate affairs, as we have here. Be this as it may, the rest of the story is soon told, so far as the incidents are concerned. But we would not have a single stanza overlooked; for if Tennyson does not scruple to violate the unities, and sometimes does some violence to nature herself—and we think we may add, some injustice to woman—it is not the less true that nowhere in "Enoch Arden" is he more poetical than in those passages in which he transgresses most in these respects. The character of Enoch is finely described; in no other part of the poem is the author so happy as in this, recalling as it does, some of the most musical and most vigorous passages in Maude and the Idylls of the King. It is, however, a great defect that he has no fault to find with the conduct of Annie; but, on the contrary, rather regards her, upon the whole, as a model of her class. There is a similar defect in his portraiture of Enoch Arden, since nine-tenths of those who read it will think that, in the opinion of the poet, it is rather a praiseworthy thing for a man who happens to get poor to let a more fortunate person take possession of the wife he loves, and with her of his children, and retire into obscurity himself for fear of disturbing their happiness. The terrible anguish of the poor wanderer on finding his house desolate, and all his hopes of happiness blighted forever, are well described in the following passage:

"Now when the dead man come to life beheld
His wife his wife no more, and saw the babe
Hers, yet not his, upon the father's knee,
And all the warmth, the peace, the happiness,

And his own children tall and beautiful,
And him, that other, reigning in his place,
Lord of his rights and of his children's love,—
Then he, tho' Miriam Lane had told him all,
Because things seen are mightier than things heard,
Stagger'd and shook, holding the branch, and fear'd
To send abroad a shrill and terrible cry,
Which in one moment, like the blast of doom,
Would shatter all the happiness of the hearth."—p. 35.

He steals back and hides himself. This is not natural; still less natural is it for a man who loves his wife to bless and pray for her, because she hastens to take another in his stead as soon as she thinks she has an opportunity. But Enoch Arden does more than this: he also blesses his rival, the man who deprived him of his wife's affections! Such a statement may well be incredible; but the following are the words put into the mouth of the dying man:

"I charge you now,
When you shall see her, tell her that I died
Blessing her, praying for her, loving her;
Save for the bar between us, loving her
As when she laid her head beside my own.
And tell my daughter Annie, whom I saw
So like her mother, that my latest breath
Was spent in blessing her and praying for her.
And tell my son that I died blessing him.
And say to Philip that I blest him too;
He never meant us anything but good.
But if my children care to see me dead,
Who hardly knew me living, let them come,
I am their father; but she must not come,
For my dead face would vex her after-life."—pp. 40, 41.

There may be men who think and feel in this way; but if there be the world contains not many such; and perhaps it is well it should not. In any case, Enoch Arden will be read more than any poem Tennyson's.

La Gaviota: a Spanish Novel. By FERNAN CABELLERO. Translated by J. LEANDER STARR. 16mo., pp. 281. New York: M. Doolady, 18[illegible]

THE only part of this volume which is not creditable to the translator is the dedication to ex-Mayor Opdyke. If he intended to be satirical: speaking of the able manner in which Mr. Opdyke filled "the civic chair of this great city," thereby rendering himself "both distinguished and respected," it is all very well. The same observation will apply to the assertion that that gentleman's "career has been marked by the most devoted patriotism," &c. Perhaps the translator alludes to certain gold and blanket contracts in which the ex-mayor took some interest for the benefit of his country; if not, we cannot see in what sense he can be said to have evinced any extraordinary amount of patriotism. In any case, the quotation from the King of Israel, as applied to Mr. Opdyke, is exceedingly inappropriate; it might nearly as well have been applied to Sir Thomas Thumb, since he, too, has "stood forth at the period of the nation's trial *as an unflinching supporter of constitutional government!*"

Now, in the name of common sense, where has Mr. Opdyke stood forth as an unflinching supporter of anything? On what occasion has he

evinced the least courage, when courage was needed? We have, certainly, no feeling against Mr. Opdyke; we have no doubt that he is a well-meaning, honest man; but, in sooth, he is no hero; nor is there any reason why his name should be "revered" "throughout every State," as the translator of "Gaviota" tells him it will be.

But we have no such faults to find with Colonel Starr's version of one of the best stories to be found in the whole range of modern Spanish fiction. In this he exhibits taste and judgment, a thorough knowledge of the Castilian, and literary talent of no mean order. His translation has, we believe, been well received; but it deserves to be generally read, especially by the ladies.

Mount Vernon, and other Poems. By HARVEY RICE. Second edition, 12mo., pp. 221. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1865.

As we are in the habit of looking to the publishers of Boston rather than to those of New York for good poetry, it is only by accident that this volume has fallen into our hands. Personally we have no knowledge of the author, and we are certainly under no compliments to his publishers; but we are not the less disposed on this account to do justice to the genuine merit of the book. We undertake this all the more cheerfully because it comes without any flourish; it is dedicated to no one; it has not even a preface. The reader is allowed to form his own opinion, without any suggestions from the author. We note this with pleasure, because it is in creditable contrast with the general habit. At the same time, we do not say that Mr. Rice is a great poet; but that he occasionally, if not always, writes true poetry, is an opinion from which no competent judge who examines the unpretending volume before us will be likely to dissent. The contents embrace a considerable variety of subjects, including patriotism, love, the domestic affections, friendship, the beauties of nature, &c. The poem which gives its title to the book is neither the longest nor the best, although it will compare favorably with the most pretentious tributes paid to the Father of his Country. The following allusion to the surrender of Cornwallis is in good taste; it does not evince the less appreciation of Washington for acknowledging the valor of his foe:

> "Cornwallis! still thy shade
> Bewails, methinks, the fated hour
> That saw thee yield thy valiant blade,
> A prize to sterner power.
> With spirit bowed, till then untaught to cower!"—p. 16.

Even in time of war, it were well that the foemen would do each other justice. Generosity to an enemy, especially when he is in our power, is not only laudable in itself as evidence of a superior nature, but its influence is always salutary; whereas abuse and vituperation injure none so much as those who use them. Another agreeable and patriotic effort is that entitled "Haunts of Childhood;" from which we learn that the

author is a native of New England. The first stanza, although scarcely a fair specimen, will give an idea of its character:

"Though dear to me are Western charms,
Rivers and lakes, with outstretched arms,
And prairies broad and free;
Yet dearer still my Native Land,
Her mountains, vales, and ocean strand,
With old, tried friends to grasp my hand,
And welcome me!"—p. 26.

The longest poem in the collection is "The Land of Freedom," written in the Spenserian stanza. Scattered here and there through this there are some fine thoughts; indeed, in more than one passage, the author soars quite high, making a near approach to, if not quite attaining, a sublime strain. Its greatest defect is its exaggerated praise of the witch-burning Puritans. There are features in their character which we like very well; but we very much dislike their coarse and brutal fanaticism. It is no credit to any people to emigrate to avoid persecution, if they become more relentless persecutors themselves than those from whom they have escaped. The following stanza combines the faults and merits of the poem more than perhaps any other that we could give:

"True to their faith, the Puritans were bold,
And breathed a spirit which is destined yet
To sway the world, and truths still new unfold,
Commingling elements that ne'er have met,
And prompting thoughts the world will not forget—
Great thoughts, and doctrines, too, of human right;
For they were men who broke, without regret,
Through ancient barriers, gifted with might
That none can crush, yet guided with celestial light."—p. 186.

We think it will be pretty generally admitted, that if we "sway the world," it is not the Puritans we have to thank for it. As well might ancient Rome, when the undisputed mistress of the world, give the credit of her glory to the ignorant banditti to whom Romulus afforded an asylum. The Puritans were, in general, honest men; but if one of them ever conceived an original idea, we have never heard of it. Even that of burning the poor old women for witchcraft was borrowed; and the same might be said of their persecutions of the Baptists and Quakers. Upon the whole, then, we think that Butler has given a much truer portraiture of the Puritans, in his "Hudibras," than Mr. Rice has in his "Land of Freedom." But the latter is much more at home in illustrating the gentler affections, than he is in delineating historical portraits—a fact which some idea may be formed from the following effusion:

THE VAIN REQUEST.

Give me the heart that's pure and warm,
Whose virtues constant shine;
Give me the soul that's nobly great,
Yet melts in grief with mine.

Give me the rosy, blushing cheek,
The lip without a stain;
Give me the meekly pensive eye,
Whose flash thrills every vein.

Give me the sweet, responsive smile,
Love's sympathy refined;
Give me an angel's graceful form,
An angel's sinless mind.

Ay, give me nature, spirit, fire,
A gem of brilliant ray,
In one, who heeds my every wish,
Though absolute her sway!

Give me but woman thus endowed,
Whose jewels virtues are,
And I will worship like a saint,
So beautiful a star!

But ah, how vain, how vain to ask
A gift so rich and rare,
Since earthly bliss is but a dream,
And beauty frail as fair!—pp. 64, 65.

though we have already devoted more time and space to "Mount on" than we thought we could, we must make room for yet another men. It will be seen that the moon has seldom received a hand-tribute, or one in which there is more melody and sweetness.

THE QUEEN OF NIGHT.

Pale wanderer in the azure field,
That blossometh with stars;
Guarding thy breast with silver shield,
Yet hurling silver bars,
Say, why so fickle, in thy round,
Through realms celestial and profound?

And why, with ever-smiling face,
O'er golden pathways lone,
Dost thou at eve delight to chase
Dim shadows, all thine own,
Yet beautiful—and lovely too—
As rosy nymphs that brush the dew?

And why, in thine employ, retain
That archer ever bold,
Who aims at maiden and at swain
His arrows tipped with gold;
Yet strives to soothe, with winning art,
And holiest vow, the wounded heart?

Empress of love!—'tis ever thine
To wield a magic power,
That's earthly half, and half divine;
And thine the witching hour,
When pledges sweet are often given—
Yet only true—when sealed in heaven!—pp. 98, 99.

short, "Mount Vernon" is no mere collection of ordinary verses. volume contains more genuine poetry than a score of much greater nsions, which we have felt it our duty to examine. Indeed some of oems we have alluded to in this hurried glance would not lose by a arison, for their beauty, grace, and tenderness, with some of the hap- similar effusions of the American muse. If Mr. Rice will only study est models better than he has yet done—if he will remember that oetry of Greece and Rome is not merely pleasing and beautiful in ; but that it has a marvellous effect in refining the taste, and affords inspiration—we do not hesitate to predict that he is destined to take gh rank among the minstrels of our country.

Studies for Stories. By JEAN INGELOW. 12mo. pp. 401. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1865.

WE have here five stories, each of which has peculiar charms; namely, The Cucumbers, My Great Aunt's Picture, Dr. Deane's Governess, The Stolen Treasure, and Emily's Ambition. We should have given our impressions in full of at least one or two of these had the volume reach us in time. As it is, we can only observe, in general terms, that the book will amply repay perusal; that it teaches excellent moral lessons, and is abundantly lively and attractive withal. The spirit of the poetess, and the good sense and delicacy of the true woman are everywhere apparent in its pages.

Virginia, and other Poems. By JOHN HENRY VOSBURGH. 16mo., pp. 18 New York: James Miller, 1865.

WE have here a modest little volume. The author makes neither pretensions nor excuses in his brief preface; he tells us that he has been induced to collect and publish pieces written at different times, only one being of recent composition; and he leaves the rest to the reader. There is, indeed, nothing very striking in his effusions, but several of them are very pleasing. Some two or three possess a grace, tenderness, and pathos which prove beyond dispute that if he has not yet earned the name of a poet, it is not the less true that he is gifted in no inconsiderable degree with the genuine poetic spirit. But it is not in his larger pieces so much as in his briefer efforts that we find the evidence of this. We do not like that which gives its title to the volume, and which occupies the first place; its style is rather crude; it contains too many expletives; too many slang terms. We know that many will like it all the better for this; and we admit that chasteness of expression would sometimes be rather out of place in illustrating camp life, as, for example, in "The Contraband's Speech." At all events it is not the author's forte to describe the grim features of war; his muse is much more congenially engaged in describing the quiet scenes of nature, and portraying the gentler affections of the soul. The following description of a river boating scene is indeed not the best of its kind we have seen, but it fully equals some of the similar efforts of those whose poetical genius none question:

"Arrows of golden light,
From the sun's quiver,
Piercing the ether bright,
Glance on the river.

"Darts of a richer light,
Fair eyes are beaming,
Sparkles of keen delight
Through our souls gleaming.

"Row o'er the smiling tide,
Gaily and gladly!
Joy-winged the moments glide,
Sweetly or madly.

Skies smile at joyous skies,
O'er and 'neath the river.
Woke from rich tones and eyes,
Soul-echoes shiver.

"Sky-bounded waters beam
A verdure-fringed island.
Through Day's night-portals gleam
Glimpses of Joyland.

"O'er hearts and waters dance
Bright foam-bells of pleasure,
Above and below advance
Stars in the azure."—pp. 64, 65.

"Manhood's Paean" is an agreeable trifle of another kind. There is not much depth of thought or feeling in it, but not a little melody and sweetness. A slight tinge of melancholy pervades it, which serves to sink deeper into the soul those emotions which the most thoughtless cannot altogether suppress at the recollection of happy moments never to return. We can only make room for the opening stanza, as we have to give yet another extract before we close:

"Where are ye fled, bright hopes
That stood on youth's sweet shore?
Say why joy's crimson portal ope's
To the land of dreams no more!
Gone is the pure delight
Of childhood glad and gay;
No more may youth in sorrow's night
Sing its exultant lay.
Time's shadow dims the joyous light
Of that fair day."—p. 58.

The series of brief pieces entitled "Songs of Nature" are in our opinion the best in the book. In "Amoron" there are indeed some lively passages; the variety of the metre has a pleasing effect; in more than one instance we find in it no indifferent specimen of a lyric of light and graceful movement, alternating with solemn hexameters, but no such charming morceau as the following:

"Over the hill tops,
Over the plain;
Bowing the tree tops,
Waving the grain,
The winds sweep by with a sigh or moan,
And thus they speak with musical tone:

"We drive the clouds;
We drive the rain;
We scatter the leaves,
And scour the plain;
And ever we sing a mournful song
As we rush with lightning speed along.

"In summer we sigh
With a softer tone;
In winter we wail
With a sadder moan;
We aid dread Ruin's song to swell;
And sound in autumn the Summer's knell.

"We live where grief
And mourning dwell;
Of sorrow and wrong
We sadly tell;
The flowers tremble when we rush by
With our message dread, that all must die.

"The breath of the earth;
The voice of the grave;
We waken the storm
And slumbering wave:
We lash the sea into sparkling foam,
And sing of death wherever we roam."—pp. 43, 44.

This shows that the author can be chaste in language as well as in sentiment. We may, therefore, avoid the disagreeable task of pointing out some very glaring defects. We think it will be sufficient to remark in general terms that what Mr. Vosburgh should chiefly guard against is redundancy in the use of words; if he will also take care that the language he makes use of exactly expresses the idea he means to convey, and nothing foreign to it, nothing that conflicts with it, or that diverts the attention of the reader from it, we feel assured that he has only to persevere and imbue his mind as much as possible with the spirit of the best models in order to attain a degree of success which he himself has hardly anticipated.

ETHICS AND RELIGION.

1. *Golden Sayings of De Sales.*
2. *Our Vows: a Work to be Read in Preparation for Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist.* By Rev. RICHARD LOWNDES, A. M., Vicar of Sturminster-Newton, Dorsetshire. New York: Gen. Protestant Episcopal S. S. Union, 1865.

THESE are slender volumes, but they contain excellent thoughts, and are tastefully got up. The sayings of De Sales are such as all denominations of Christians may combine in admiring. Indeed there is no sect which has not borrowed more or less of the thoughts of that good man; for what we are told in the preface of the tiny volume before us is literally true, namely, that "Francis De Sales has the beauty of Fénélon, and the depth of à Kempis, with a tenderness peculiarly his own."

We trust there is no reader of this journal so bigoted or foolish as to admire the beautiful maxims of De Sales anything the less because the author was the founder of the order of the Nuns of the Visitation, known in most parts of Europe by the name of the Salesian Nuns; for no liberal-minded person, let him belong to what sect he may, who has learned anything of the habits and objects of those good ladies, would deny that no other women

ıake a nearer approach to the character of ministering angels. Their order ras first established at Annecy, in Savoy, in 1660, as a refuge for widows nd sick females; there are still communities of them in all Christian ountries, and they have never swerved from the duties imposed upon ıem by their venerable founder. They still devote themselves to the ılief of the sick and unfortunate, and they have assumed the additional uty of educating girls.

There are many well-meaning but narrow-minded persons, who ıeer at the Episcopal Church because it is willing to recognize greatess and goodness wherever it finds those qualities. When other ›ots become equally enlightened, they will be equally liberal. The hurch that has produced men like Tillotson, Butler, Warburton, nd Paley, can afford to despise that petty jealousy which can see o good in anything that does not emanate from its own muddy fountain. he Episcopal church is not only learned, but it has the good sense to know rhence its learning has come. While the Anglican church may well boast f Oxford and Cambridge, it refuses to forget that both were founded y men like De Sales; and it is sufficiently evident that the members of ıose noble institutions themselves are not altogether oblivious of the pirit which produced them. This is as it should be; it is only for Ignoınce and Thoughtlessness to hate, rather than love, their benefactors.

There are several maxims in the little book under consideration which ılly bear us out in these views. "The soul's greatest gain in virtue," ıys De Sales, "consists not in thinking much on God, but in loving him;" nd need we add that those who love God will hardly hate their neighbor ecause he has not exactly the same faith which they have. "Pagans," he ıys, "love those who love them; but it pertains to Christians to show iendship to those who love them not—nay, towards the objects of their ıpugnance and aversion." Against national prejudices he says: "Avoid ›eaking ill of other nations. If they all have their particular defects, ıey all have, too, their special excellences." One more is all we ın make room for, but it is worth a dozen: "An ounce of work done eely amidst dryness and darkness of soul is worth a hundred pounds rought among consolations and transports." Would that some of the ınsation preachers of the present day, who are much better suited for ıe stage than the pulpit, would study and digest some of these "Golden ayings!"

The character of the second volume mentioned at the head of this otice is sufficiently indicated by its title. It contains a good deal of ıdicious advice and interesting information regarding the sacraments, nd is written in a clear, lucid style, and in a liberal, Christian spirit, lthough designed exclusively for Episcopalians, we think that Presbyırians, Methodists, Baptists, &c., would derive profit from its perusal. he volume is printed in tasteful style, and neatly bound in muslin.

Pastoral Letter of the Most Rev. Martin John Spalding, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore, together with the late Encyclical of the Holy Father, and the Syllabus of Errors condensed. Baltimore: Kelly & Piet. 1865.

Our readers are aware that we are not in the habit of noticing the pastoral letters of any denomination; but we do not hesitate to make an exception in the present instance, partly because the subject is not that of an ordinary pastoral, and partly because the "Letter" before us possesses merit of a high order as a literary effort. We confess that in general we rarely open such documents, so that those who send them to us dispose of them in an unprofitable way. But Archbishop Spalding is the author of a "History of the Protestant Reformation," which is written with considerable ability, exhibits extensive research, and is characterized by great liberality of thought and feeling; to such an extent is it distinguished by these features that had it fallen into our hands at the time of its publication, we would have reviewed it at length if only to show by some extracts that even a controversial writer can be abundantly logical and forcible in his arguments, without using a harsh or discourteous expression. But if we thought it too late to review a work which had already attracted so much attention in Europe as well as in this country, its perusal had at least the effect of determining us to review the first work emanating from the same pen; and we have watched so well accordingly that we are pretty sure this is the first since the time alluded to. The late Encyclical Letter of the Pope affords Dr. Spalding an ample opportunity to display his peculiar powers, and accordingly he proves one of the most vigorous and most successful defenders of the pontiff. We are not of those who thought at any time that the document which has attracted so much attention throughout Christendom, and which has received such unqualified condemnation in certain quarters, was designed to have any injurious influence on our free institutions. We felt satisfied from a careful perusal that it was directed mainly, if not exclusively, against the so-called Red Republicans, Communists, Fourierites, &c., &c., of continental Europe—against those who, under whatever name, seek to bring religion into contempt. But let us hear the archbishop on the alleged bearing of the Encyclical on the affairs of this country:

"To stretch the words of the pontiff, evidently intended for the stand-point of European radicals and infidels, so as to make them include the state of things established in this country, by our noble Constitution, in regard to the liberty of conscience, of worship, and of the press, were manifestly unfair and unjust. Divided as we were in religious sentiment from the very origin of our government, our fathers acted most prudently and wisely in adopting, as an Amendment to the Constitution, the organic law, that 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' (Amend. 1.) In fact, under the circumstances, they could have adopted no other course, consistently with the principles and even with the very existence of our newly-established government.

"In adopting this Amendment, they certainly did not intend, like the

ropean radicals, disciples of Tom Paine and of the French Revolution, to nounce all religions, whether true or false, equal before God, but only to de- re them equal before the law; or rather, simply to lay down the sound and ditable principle, that the civil government, adhering strictly to its own ap- priate sphere of political duty, pledged itself not to interfere with religious iters, which it rightly viewed as entirely without the bounds of its ipetency. The founders of our government were, thank God, neither tudinarians nor infidels; they were earnest, honest men; and however much ne of them may have been personally lukewarm in the matter of religion, or y have differed in religious opinions, they still professed to believe in Christ his revelation, and exhibited a commendable respect for religious observ- es. Therefore their action could not have been condemned, or even contem- ed, by the pontiff, in his recent solemn censure, pronounced *on an altogether rent set of men with a totally different set of principles*—on men and on principles ery clearly and emphatically portrayed in the document itself, which every nd canon of interpretation requires to be strictly construed."

Now that the time for calm reflection has come, we think that few, if , will deny this. It will be seen that Dr. Spalding shows some excel- t reasons why we should not be too ready to believe that Pius IX. is riendly to free government:

"All impartial men, Venerable and Beloved Brethren, who are acquainted h the mild and amiable character, and with the eventful and almost roman- history of our venerated and beloved Pius IX., will be slow to judge harshly nything he has ever said, written, or done. Taken from the bosom of the ple who so loved him, though himself of noble lineage, he was raised to the tificate amidst the acclamations of the people. He at once threw himself their arms, and, first of all European sovereigns, he inaugurated free in- ations far in advance of the times, as the event proved. He proclaimed a eral Amnesty, brought back the political exiles, and, amidst the congratu- ons of Europe and America, he granted and proclaimed a liberal Constitu- to his people, whose idol he at once became.

"The scene soon changes, and what was so auspiciously begun and so gen- ly granted, soon terminates disastrously, and the glory of the new Pontiff- g speedily sets in blood, not shed by him—for he never shed any one's od—but shed by those very men, whose signal benefactor he had been, and now, in return, repay his goodness with ungrateful treachery and bloody hinations against his throne and his very life. His prime minister is assas- ted at the very opening of the chambers under the Constitution; the bloody ger is paraded in triumph through the streets of the eternal city; the so ly idolized Pontiff is besieged in his own palace by a mob goaded to fury by conspirators, and the ball, which was probably intended for him, strikes n at his side his amiable and learned private secretary, Dr. Palma; he es- s himself at length in disguise, and he becomes an exile at Gaeta, where world loves and reverences him in his fallen fortunes, more even, perhaps, a it had done when he was dwelling in the splendid palaces of his predeces- . His divine Lord and Master was insulted and crucified by the people ng whom he had gone about doing good; and it was meet that the disciple uld not be above the Master."

his is a striking picture, and it must be admitted by every reflecting d acquainted with the circumstances, that it is not at all overdrawn. at Protestant forgets how much he wondered, some sixteen years ago, he exemplary liberality of Pius IX.? Not only did he set a good exam- to other sovereigns by granting a constitution to his people, but he ad- d every Catholic prince to be equally liberal. Limited as our space is his department of our journal, we will make room for one more extract.

Nor will any unprejudiced person, who has carefully read the Encyclical, deny the existence of the moral courage which the archbishop describes with such eloquence and pathos:

"Amidst the fearful tempest which now threatens with shipwreck the feeble bark of Peter, the attitude of the humble Successor of the Fisherman is calm collected, imperturbable, verging even on the sublime! It is the living embodiment of moral power clad in the panoply of heaven, contending hopefully and heroically against overwhelming physical force, armed with the terrible appliances of modern warfare. A feeble old man, the weakest of all the sovereigns of Europe, despoiled by brute force of the better and richer portion of the small domain which had descended to him in peaceful and unquestioned succession for more than a thousand years, and which he held in sacred trust for the benefit of all Christendom; his status determined, and his possessions—or rather those of the Church—bartered away by diplomatic negotiations and conventions, coolly entered into, without either his participation or consent, by powerful neighbors calling themselves children of the Church; brought to bay, at length, by the approaching crisis in his affairs, is he cast down, is he overwhelmed? No; but he rises buoyantly on the wave which threatens to engulf him, and, elevating himself to the full height of the emergency, he dares proclaim to emperors, kings, and peoples, great truths and principles, which they appear to have forgotten, which it was not pleasant for them to hear, but which it was his duty to utter. With calm dignity becoming his station, he alludes not directly to his own particular grievances, but he takes in, at a glance, the evil principles and influences which threaten the subversion of all Society and of all Religion; and he boldly proclaims, that might does not consecrate right, that God and His Church are not to be banished with impunity from the government of the world, that human legislation is not to overbear divine principles and institutions, and that infidelity and radicalism will destroy, while Religion alone can save human ciety from the deluge of evils which threatens its disorganization."

That an old man like Pius IX. should launch forth to the world so wonderfully vigorous, bold, and startling a document, in the present critical condition of his affairs, may well be ranked among the psychological phenonema of the age; for, that those various topics are handled with great ability in the Encyclical, and that it exhibits almost incredible research, are facts admitted by all competent judges. Certain it is that, considering it altogether, apart from the dogmas which it inculcates, we do not remember to have read any document of equal extent which so forcibly reminded us of the Horacian precept:

"Doctrina sed vim promovet insitam
Rectique cultus pectora roborant."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Annual Reports of various Insurance Companies. New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, 1865.

The pile of documents before us exhibits a considerable increase in the business of insurance during the past year; and we feel satisfied that although many policy-holders have been disappointed, as usual, for the simple reason that they exercised no discrimination in procuring those policies, the general amount of good accomplished has increased in an equal ratio. The intelligent portion, even of those who have been swindled, have undiminished faith in the value of insurance; for they know that

ave only themselves to blame for confiding in a class of insurers who are nable to insure themselves against heavy mortgages, on what they call eir capital stock; they find that their neighbors, who pursued a different ourse, got every penny to which they were entitled. Not a few of the mpanies who have thus brought discredit on insurance, have been bliged either to retire from the field, or to increase their capital and im-ove their conduct. All will have to do so before long, if it be not the ult of the public; because there are so many substantial and reliable mpanies that there is no excuse for dealing with those of the opposite aracter. What is most important just now to those seeking the pro-ction of insurance is, that they should be on their guard against the merous new insurance companies springing up almost weekly like fungi. ; is hardly necessary to observe that we do not mean that all new mpanies are to be avoided; on the contrary, we feel satisfied that there re some of the newest which afford as good protection as the old, so far s they undertake it. But be it remembered that these are the fewest in mber; and consequently that a close scrutiny is necessary in order to void being swindled.

At present, more discrimination is necessary in effecting marine in-rance, the most ancient of all, than any other kind. There are four mes as many companies as the public need; but because a large propor-on of our merchants are disposed to divide their patronage, this does not revent the organization of new companies. Besides, there are many fire mpanies which, failing to succeed in that branch, have managed to se-re the right of accepting marine risks also. That some have done so in ood faith, far be it from us to deny; but, if we have not been grossly isinformed, and we have made extensive and careful enquiries, the num-er is considerably less than is generally supposed—certainly not more an one out of every five. The remaining four will dupe as many as ey can, and then retire, but only to appear, under other names, a few ears hence, or perhaps in one year after they have swindled as many as ould put any faith in their pretensions. At first sight it may seem dif-cult to believe this; but illustrations of it are constantly occurring various forms; in other words, there are many who know to their ost that we do not misrepresent the facts.

The marine company which has done most business during the past ear in proportion to its stock, age, &c., is the Columbian. No other com-any, of any age or capital, has exhibited more unequivocal proofs of pro-perity; and what is much more important to the public, no company as proved a more reliable protection to those of its policy-holders who appened to need its aid. In addition to various other evidences, we have he authority of several who received its checks for this. More than ne have assured us that the conduct of the officers of the Columbian Ma-ine Insurance Company, when applied to by policy-holders who have

sustained serious losses, is princely in the noblest sense of the term. Indeed, the fact is admitted by the officers of some of its rivals; for in insurance, as well as in other respectable kinds of business, there is that sort of generous rivalry which not only recognises the good done by others, but gives free expression to its admiration for it. There is no well regulated mind to which it is not a source of genuine pleasure to see those prosper who both mean well and do well. Accordingly, we will here note some of the very significant figures in the statement of the Columbian for the year 1864: The total amount of premiums was $6,213,114.68; the excess of earned premiums over losses, &c., $2,064,754.02; the sum paid during the year for losses, $2,389,847.14; the amount of profits to be divided, $1,413,944.87. It has likewise paid large dividends, both in cash and scrip. After all necessary deductions, its assets amount to $5,938,572.78, and we see that this sum is to be increased by the addition of a million and a half in cash, which will make a grand total of $7,488,572.78. Such is the record of a company which did not issue its first policy until August, 1857.

Two years ago we remarked, in reviewing documents similar to these now before us, that a large proportion of the former customers of the Atlantic and *Moon* were giving the preference to the new company; and the insurance organs affected to sneer very wisely at us, for entertaining so erroneous and unfounded an opinion. Now, they substantially admit the fact: the senile corporations mentioned are feeling it more and more from year to year; hence it is that they are not half so arrogant, rude, and overbearing as they used to be. Some of their former customers wonder at the improved manners of the Joneses and the Dennises. The president of the Moon, too, finds it necessary to devote more of his time to insurance and less to politics. We are assured that the English language no longer suffers half as much at the hands of the latter as it used two years, or even one year ago; and that he no longer attributes the foundering or wreck of a vessel, which he has insured, to the cook or the cabin-boy. It is even said that the vice-president of the Atlantic talks again of going to the war; and very nearly in as brave and patriotic terms as he did about a week *before* Fort Sumter was attacked by the rebels. What has kept the gentleman at home since we do not pretend to know; no doubt there is sufficient reason for it; at all events it is better late than never.

But if he goes now we shall be ill-natured enough to give at least a part of the credit to the officers of the Columbian Marine, and another part to those of the Mercantile Mutual. We are well aware that if either had a hold of our pen we should not speak thus; but we hope they will excuse us, as it is just as much our business to review and criticise as it is theirs to sign policies and give checks to those who have sustained losses. Be it remembered that he is no judge, in the true sense of the term, who

s a similar sentence on all; or who does not discriminate. Who will that the insurance companies in Wall street and elsewhere are as ent from each other, as the various publications we have to review? atter are admitted by all intelligent persons to be good, bad, and in- ent, the good being always the fewest; but it would be a bad book d that could inflict more misery than a bad insurance company. We t say that any of the companies mentioned are absolutely bad; but rtainly think some of them very indifferent in some respects.

the statement of the Mercantile Mutual for 1864, we find increased nces of progress, and additional proof of the value of marine insu- when judiciously secured. Thus, its premiums on policies issued g the year amount to $1,281,818.80; the premiums not marked off at ose of the year, to $190,261.95—making a total of $1,472,080.75. narine inland losses for the year were $398,908.21. After all neces- deductions, the profits for the year to be divided, amount to 415.46; and the total assets on January 1, to $1,553,227.06. This its an increase to last year's assets of about $100,000. A company that its results like these at the close of the year, and pays an interest per cent. on the outstanding certificates of profits; pays a dividend en per cent. in cash to its stockholders; and a further scrip dividend enty per cent. on the net earned premiums, to its policy-holders, well be regarded as a *protective* institution.

ie statement of the Metropolitan Insurance Company is somewhat sed. It would seem that its mathematician, although said to be a earned man, sometimes confounds multiplication with subtraction. apital of the company is set down at $300,000. This a modest sum h for a corporation that undertakes to afford protection against narine and fire risks; but we confess we do not know any, either ers or landsmen, that have been protected thereby. We think the ington Marine would do well to alter its name. None of Washing- glory was acquired on sea. The hero's name is very appropriate as d to a fire company; and we have one that is worthy of it—one imply styles itself the Washington Insurance Company. We think he could speak himself from his honored grave, he would object to eaf his name by the Pine street corporation. If we can read its ent aright, its losses and expenses for 1864, including office rent, s of errand boys, drummers, &c., amounted to nearly its whole l stock. Unlike the Washington Marine, the Orient Mutual In- e Company has a very appropriate title, for it indulges quite largely ental hyperbole; but those who have ships or cargoes to insure, do m to appreciate that sort of thing, and the consequence is, that tal amount of premiums for ten months amounts, even at the al mode of calculation, only to $344,069.80.

ere has been a large increase in fire insurance during the year; and

the general results seem satisfactory both to the insured and the insurers; although the amount of damage done by fire in this country, in 1864, is estimated in round numbers at nearly thirty millions of dollars. A large number of new fire companies have been organized during the year, but only a very small number exhibit any very decided evidence of vitality. First among these is the Morris Fire and Inland, which seems destined to rival even the Columbian Marine in prosperity and success. Nor is there any reason why it should not, since it has the benefit of the energy, intelligence, and experience of the same chief officers who have rendered the latter a model in all that constitutes a first-class insurance company. The cash capital, paid in of the Morris Fire and Inland, amounts to $200,000, and its authorized capital is $5,000,000. Were we to state the amount of business which it is said to have done during the last six months by those who have no interest in giving it more credit than they know from experience it deserves, we should almost seem to indulge in the fabulous.

We are sorry to learn that the Croton Fire Insurance, which commenced operations nearly at the same time, has a very different record. It is now announced that its scrip is to accumulate to $200,000 before it can be redeemed, and that it is subject to be drawn upon and made liable to meet losses before the capital can be impaired. This is rather ominous—at least not very encouraging to those having property to insure. The president is said to be very skilful in groceries and kindred goods, but his qualifications as an underwriter are rather doubtful. In short, we fear that, upon the whole, the policy-holders of the Croton will have to depend more on the Croton water in time of danger than on any document emanating from that quarter; but we should be glad to learn at any time, for the benefit of our readers, that we are mistaken in this.

The Washington (Fire), already alluded to, continues to exhibit evidences of energy, enterprise, and success. No other company gives larger dividends, or presents a larger surplus in proportion to its capital stock. On the 2d of February last it made its fourth consecutive scrip dividend of 60 per cent.; and exhibited a surplus over its cash capital, ($400,000,) of $260,000. The Hope Fire is another company which has made great progress within the last two or three years. We see that during 1864 it received premiums to the amount of $195,000, and paid $20,000 to its stockholders, and $94,000 for losses. This is a handsome record. The president makes no display, but does his duty in a quiet manner, and, as the tree is known by its fruit, shows that he perfectly understands his business. We are pleased to observe that the Continental begins to comprehend its position; it is by no means so arrogant or pretentious as it was a year or two ago. There is still room for improvement, however, for it is by no means the sort of corporation which its officers would have the world believe. The Phœnix Fire, of Brooklyn, makes but little noise, but its policy is held in high esteem in more than one sense. Its officers

re straightforward energetic men, who fully understand the business of nderwriting. But it must not be confounded with the Brooklyn Fire nsurance Company, which we are assured is a very different concern. ; is true that from our own knowledge we cannot say anything of the tter, and it may be that, if the truth were known, it is equally independ- nt as to the opinions of others. At the same time, we confess we should ther insure in some other company; right or wrong, we should be raid tl at Mr. Furland would find some flaw in our policy at the critical oment.

Of all the life companies, that whose Report for 1864 reached us first, the New England Mutual, and we will notice it first accordingly. This e do all the more willingly, independently of the high character of that stitution, because it was accompanied with a handsome bound volume ntaining the Annual Reports of the company from 1844 to 1862, clusive. In his preface to the latter the secretary tells us that it "is blished to supply the demand for copies of the entire series, both by mbers of the company and public libraries in the United States and broad, the original edition of most of the numbers being exhausted. opies are demanded for libraries, in order, with those and other similar blications, to preserve historical records and statistics of life insurance the United States. And individual members of the company, who ave not a full series, and also those proposing to become members, are turally desirous of gaining a knowledge of the subject of life insurance, nd of the principles and rules of practice upon which the business of the ompany is conducted. The collection will be of use to professors and thers, whose pursuits and tastes lead them to the cultivation of economical nd social science." It is sufficient for us to say, that the marked ability rith which most of the reports in the volume before us are writ- en, and the candor and intelligence with which they discuss the hole subject of life insurance, fully justify the impressions which led o its publication. We have ourselves read not a little on the subject, n different languages; and we cheerfully admit that in no volume of qual size have we found more striking and philosophical views, or more nanswerable arguments in favor of life insurance.

The Twenty-first Annual Report gives an analysis of the business of the ompany for the year ending November 30, 1864. Among the interest- ing facts which it records are the following: The number of members at this date was 7,613, who were interested in policies to the amount of $23,596,632. Of this number, 1,750 were admitted during the past year, the insurances on their applications amounting to more than $5,300,000. The amount of losses during the year was $280,200. After deducting this amount, $2,651,116.59, remains to meet future losses and liabilities, which exhibits an increase on the fund of the previous year of more than half a million ($603,000). During 1864, one hundred and six policies issued on one

hundred and one lives terminated by the death of the insured; of these, ninety-seven, amounting to $224,200, were for the benefit of surviving families; and the remaining number, amounting to $36,000, were for the benefit of creditors. Of the 1,750 new policies issued, 1,680, amounting to $5,188,560, were for life and endowment periods, and 70, amounting to $140,000, were what are called term risks. In short, all the results are such as might be expected from a company which, like the New England Life, has always been distinguished for its intelligent and judicious management. Until recently it was very unfairly represented in New York. We had once occasion ourselves to criticise the conduct of its agent; but, in doing so, we exculpated its principal officers from all blame, feeling convinced that they would countenance nothing on the part of any of their employés but what would be strictly honorable and gentleman-like. But in future there will be no difficulty of this kind, the company being now represented in New York by Mr. Samuel S. Stevens, a brother of the accomplished vice-president, who, by his agreeable manners and business habits, has already counteracted the unfavorable influence of his predecessor, and made a large increase to the general ratio of New York customers.

The last annual statement of the New York Life shows, among other unmistakable evidences of progress and prosperity, that the company has added more than a million during the past year to its assets; which amount now to $3,658,755.55. During the same period it paid $315,200.00 for losses by death; while its taxes, internal revenue stamps, and law expenses amounted to $14,401.28. That it could well afford to pay this may be seen from the fact that the amount of premiums, endowments, and policy fees received in 1864 makes a total of $1,477,193.45. To this it need only be added that the trustees have ordered a scrip dividend of *fifty* per cent., and directed the payment of the final annual instalment of twenty per cent. on the dividends of 1850 to 1860, and the redemption in full of those declared in 1861 and 1862. The Mutual Life pretends to greater things than even these in its "statements;" but the most credulous even of those who believe in insurance miracles begin to doubt the accuracy of its figures. It is otherwise, however, with the figures of the Equitable Life, than which no company, either in this country or in Europe, has proved more successful. There are many reasons for its rapidly increasing prosperity; but suffice it to say here that there is not a shrewder, or more judicious underwriter in America than its vice-president.

The officers of other life companies, such for example as the Security and the North American, would do well to take some hints from the gentlemen of the Equitable. The Universal Life has proved quite successful thus far; and there is every reason to believe that it will be equally fortunate in the future. This insures invalids at moderate

rates; nay, it insures all who have been rejected by others, and has already paid large sums to those who had sought policies in vain elsewhere. We should like to speak in similar terms of the Travellers' Insurance Company, but the facts do not seem to justify us in doing so. It may be a reliable concern, but we confess that we should rather have any of our limbs entirely safe—nay, even our little finger—than hold the policy of the Travellers' for $5,000. We do not mean, however, that its plan is not feasible, or that it would not do much good if carried out in good faith by a company having sufficient capital. We are informed that there is a company now being organized which will insure at a moderate rate against all accidents whatever, and whose officers and trustees will be regarded as a sufficient guarantee, from their high standing as New York and Boston merchants, that what it engages to do it will faithfully perform.

If any other new life company prove as successful as the Globe Mutual, all concerned may well congratulate themselves; for the simple facts illustrative of the success of the latter would seem almost fabulous if stated in their natural order. But Mr. Pliny Freeman, its president, is now the oldest underwriter in America; he has served three apprenticeships to the profession, and graduated as the actuary of the New York Life, one of the most skilfully managed corporations of the kind in the world. In the course of six months the Globe Mutual has issued 691 policies, insuring lives to the amount of $2,000,000, and receiving premiums to the amount of $82,993. We believe that nowhere, except in the great metropolis of the Western world, could such results as these have been produced within the same space of time, even by so skilful a master in the business as Mr. Freeman.

The Guardian Life continues in the hands of a physician; nor does it seem to derive much benefit from his treatment. Whether it be that Dr. Peckham has forgotten his ancient skill (for we take it for granted that he once knew a good deal about medicine), or whether the complaint of the Guardian is of too chronic and malignant a nature for human ken to remove, certain it is that it stillseems to us in a very precarious condition. But the reverse is true of theKnickerbocker Life, which was never more full of vigor and energy than it is at present—never in a more prosperous condition. Its presiding officer was always an energetic and thoughtful business man, and one of the most accomplished of our underwriters but during the last two years he has redoubled his efforts, and at the same time secured the services of the best general agent in America. Talent, intelligence, and industry never fail in New York; and this is the best reply we can make to those who enquire for the causes of the present remarkably prosperous condition of the Knickerbocker Life. We believe the United States Life makes its full statement and divides its profits only once in three years; but none doubt either its ability, or

its disposition to meet all just claims, according as they become due. Its assets exceed one million of dollars; and there are no more prudent, skilful, and honorable underwriters than Mr. Joseph B. Collins, and Mr. John Eadie, the president and secretary.

The Manhattan Life presents various evidences of prosperity and success, not the least interesting of which is its recently completed white marble building, erected at an expense of one hundred thousand dollars. It is in the form of a trapezium, and in the latest Florentine style. The grand hall, occupied by the Manhattan Life, is 60 feet long, 40 feet wide, and 26 feet high. The walls are adorned with graceful pilasters of the Corinthian order. This spacious hall is at once ornamented and finely lighted by a dome of 20 feet in diameter. The effect of the fine volume of light thus produced on the variegated floor, which consists of marquetry, inlaid with walnut, maple, and other deep-colored woods, in the modern Venetian style, is very pleasing. One hundred thousand for so elegant an edifice is but a small amount for a corporation that has received $2,452,502.61 during the past year, and whose assets amounted to $1,991,225.38, on the first of January last.

Verily, let the grumblers say what they will, there is, after all, a wonderful virtue in life insurance, which enables the insurer to amass a princely fortune, while it not only effectually protects those that are most dear to the insured, but often secures them an ample competence for life!

Eye, Ear, Throat Diseases, Bronchitis, Catarrh, Asthma. A Book for the People. By FRANZ ADOLPH VON MOSCHZISKER, M. D., Oculist and Aurist. Author of "The Ear, its Diseases and their Treatment;" "A Guide to Diseases of the Eye and their Treatment." 12mo. pp. 153. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton, 1865.

THE contents of this volume are such as might be expected from its title. It is not a pretentious book, but is much better than those that are. The author is equally opposed to the imposture of the quacks, and to the stereotyped "rules and regulations" of the regular faculty; nor does he hesitate to criticise the latter as well as the former. That he thinks shrewdly and expresses his thoughts boldly, may be inferred from an extract. In his Introduction he gives a pretty correct portrait of a certain individual of whom we have given a sketch ourselves in an article entitled "Our Quack Doctors and their Performances."* All who read the paper alluded to will remember that we did not spare the fraternity; we made their impostures as conspicuous as possible, because we felt certain, and still do, that no class of impostors inflict more injury on a credulous community. For the same reason we now

* N. Q. R., No. XVI.

allow Dr. Von Moschzisker to give his impressions; we need hardly say that we do so all the more readily because, so far as they go, they fully corroborate the worst allegations we have made ourselves against those impudent vampires. Speaking of a somewhat famous member of the fraternity, the Doctor observes:

"The quack in question we have some personal knowledge of, and we do not hesitate to pronounce him the most ignorant, illiterate, and at the same time, most brazen-faced specimen of the whole genus of mountebanks. Some years ago he was travelling through the South, in the professional character of a *corn-cutter*, which exalted position he attempted to dignify still more by styling himself 'professor of the Pathology of the foot.' The name he then went by was "Ealing;" but when, some time afterwards, on attempting to practice in Washington, D. C., as oculist and aurist, he was arrested on a charge of imposture preferred by Dr. May, of that city, against him, he found it advisable to assume a new one. Retaining the first letter of the old name, and changing the rest, he prefixed to it the preposition 'Von' (E——g), and enlarged his sphere by setting up as a professor of eye, ear and throat diseases."—pp. 22, 23.

Barefaced and impudent as the individual thus described is, we have one of the tribe in this city who is still worse if possible. Not content with swindling hundreds of silly people out of their money, under pretence of curing them of various diseases, while in reality he does much more harm than good to his dupes, he outrages public decency by exhibiting his kept mistresses as trophies. Since ignorance, pretension, and imposture all are always arrogant and overbearing, it is not strange that of all who pollute the atmosphere of the Central Park by their presence, none drive their fast horses more recklessly, or with less regard to the safety of others, than the notorious quack alluded to. A book that helps to unmask characters of this kind is worthy of perusal on this ground alone; but that before us may be regarded as a valuable popular treatise on the most distressing and dangerous diseases of the eye, ear, and throat, and as such we do not hesitate to recommend it.

Reports of Railroad Companies, 1864, 1865.

As most of our railroads only make occasional reports, we have not many of those documents before us; but such as have reached us exhibit a considerable increase in business, and show that those who have issued them have gained rather than lost by the war, and that, in general, they are in a prosperous condition. Although we have no statistics before us of the business done during the last year by the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore railroad, we have satisfactory evidence that its business has been largely increased. This, indeed, might have been taken for granted; since it is universally admitted that no road in this country is more judiciously and ably managed. The Philadelphia and Reading road continues to improve. Its gross receipts for 1864 amounted to $9,269,841; this shows an increase on the receipts of 1863 of more than $3,000,000. After deducting the expenses from the total sum, there remains a net pro-

fit of $4,308,150. It does not take long to make fortunes at this rate. The Camden and Amboy road seems to thrive on abuse; the more fiercely it is attacked the more money it makes; for the people in general are rather prone to sympathise with those who are handled more roughly than they deserve. Indeed, in all cases of this kind, the public is apt to say, like a good master: "As long as you do your work honestly and well, as you now do, I will support you, let interested parties allege what they will against you."

The Report of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company exhibits a total of earnings for 1864 of $14,759,057.66. On deducting ordinary and extraordinary expenses from this, there remains a net profit to be divided among the stockholders of $4,065,113.47. The total earnings of the canals of the same company amount to $308,615.23. We are also shown how the money was earned. Thus the number of passengers carried during the year was nearly two millions and a half (2,360,213), the average distance travelled by each on the road being sixty-two miles. The number of tons of freight exceed the number of passengers, the former being 2,764,876. If the company were not already distinguished for the judicious skill and intelligence with which it is managed, these figures would go far to prove that it was entitled to that distinction.

Perhaps no other road in this country has made more progress in fortune-making during the last five years than the New York and Erie. From official statistics now before us, we see that, from 1859 to 1864, the total increase of its business has reached nearly nine millions in round numbers ($9,000,000). Most of this success is due to superior management. Be it remembered that in 1859, so great was the financial pressure upon it that a receiver had to be appointed for the benefit of its creditors, whereas it is now one of the most flourishing and prosperous enterprises in this country.

INDEX

TO THE

TENTH VOLUME

OF THE

National Quarterly Review.

Autumnus Holidays of a Country Parson, noticed, 185.

Chemical Analysis by Spectral Observations, article on, 143—rainbow, *ib.*—artificial rainbow, *ib.*—discovery by Fletcher, *ib.*—Dr. Dominis, *ib.*—Descartes, *ib.*—experiment with glass prism by Newton, *ib.*—theory concerning solar light, 145—spectra of the electric spark, *ib.*—apparatus used for experiments, *ib.*—mineralogy of the sun, moon, and planets, 146—Wollaston's experiment with prism, *ib.*—Fraunhofer's examination of spectra, *ib.*—his instruments, *ib.*—minimum deviation, *ib.*—refracting medium, *ib.*—measurement of angles of refraction, and to whom due, 147—analysis of light from colored flame, *ib.*—Talbot's analysis of the spectra of artificial light, *ib.*—discovery of absorption bands by colored gases, *ib.*—influence upon subsequent discoveries, *ib.*—discoveries concerning colored vapors, *ib.*—Wheatstone's prismatic decomposition of the electric, voltaic, and electro-magnetic spark, *ib.*—Cooper's observations, 140—prismatic analysis, by use of sensitive papers, *ib.*—absorptive action of the sun's atmosphere, *ib.*—incandescence of different bodies, 150—relation between the light and temperature of shining bodies, *ib.*—discovery of the unit-lamp, *ib.*—its value, *ib.*—common flames, 157—prismatic analysis of flames and gases, *ib.*—instrumental arrangement, *ib.*—spectrum of burning coals, *ib.*—experiments with sections of flame, 152—with cyanogen, 153—vibrations of burning particles, *ib.*—when ignition commences, *ib.*—color of flames at different temperatures, *ib.*—ethereal undulations, *ib.*—value of their discoveries, *ib.*—spectra of metals, 155—Plucker's examination of the spectra of the electric current in gases and vapors, 156—instrument described, *ib.*—his deductions, *ib.*—results, *ib.*

Civilizing Forces, the, article on, 33—knowledge of physical science becoming more attractive, *ib.*—physical phenomena the result of immutable laws, *ib.*—ancient priests contributed to civilization, 34—civilization the result of the action of nature upon mind, and mind upon matter, *ib.*—mental superior to physical causes, 36—effect of locality upon civilization, *ib.*—of heat, *ib.*—of cold, *ib.*—earliest traces of civilization on the watercourses of India, Asia, and Africa, *ib.*—man, averse to labor, and disposed to enslave the weak, 40—evidence derived from the pyramids of Egypt and other colossal remains, 41—effect of latitude upon poetry and progress, 42—Northern and Southern character contrasted, 47—history, on the effect of locality upon man, 49-50.

Currency—causes of depreciation, article on, 109—the state of, *ib.*—forms the basis of national prosperity, *ib.*—offices it discharges, *ib.*—should be available and permanent, 110—causes and effects of its depreciation, *ib.*—oppresses the poor, 111—embarrasses measuring value, *ib.*—inadequate to meet the necessities of labor, *ib.*—favors contractors, 112—temporary successes, disguised evils, 113—greenbacks a loan without interest, *ib.*—the profits trifling compared with the losses, 114—necessity of confidence in the national government, 115—national paper currency uncalled for, *ib.*—greenbacks as legal tender, *ib.*—disastrous results, *ib.*—redemption essential to the stability of any currency, *ib.*—the weakness and strength of banks, 116—the advantages of a redeemable paper currency anticipated, *ib.*—depreciation of greenbacks not the result of want of confidence in the government, 117—loans more sensitive to the element of trust than currency, *ib.*—gold, *ib.*—its vacillation, 118—should constitute the exclusive medium of exchange, *ib.*—without detriment to banks, 119—the right and duty of government to establish such a currency, *ib.*—difficulties to be encountered, *ib.*—intrinsic value of bank and other notes, 120—condition of the Bank of England during the war of Napoleon, 121—depreciation of its bills, *ib.*—the causes and results, *ib.*—law passed to limit the circulation, *ib.*—successful war may be followed by national bankruptcy, *ib.*—redemption sometimes impolitic, *ib.*—necessity of a firm medium of exchange, *ib.*

Enoch Arden, reviewed and criticised 381, *et seq.*

Everett, Edward, article on, 293—last appearance at Faneuil Hall, and its effect, *ib.*—his speech worthy of the orator, 294—his fame abroad, *ib.*—his multifarious labors, *ib.*—his peculiar merit, 295—general character as a thinker, *ib.*—speeches and miscellaneous writings, 296—his opportunities for study, 297—correspondence with eminent men, *ib.*—his detractors, 298—character of his intellect, 299—his rank as a statesman and diplomatist, 300—as a debator, 301—diplomatic services, 302—Hulseman letter, *ib.*—contemplated treatise, 303—considered as an author, 304—compared with other thinkers, 305—habit of preparing his speeches, 306—his festive speeches, 307—style of oratory, 308—praise of the Puritans, 309—did not say severe things when truth required them, *ib.*—his last years the most useful, 310—his recent efforts vindicate him from the charge of coldness, *ib.*—honorable life and happy death, *ib.*

De Sales, his Golden Sayings, noticed, 392-3.

Familiar Letters from Europe, reviewed and criticised, 172-5.

Fragrance from Crushed Flowers, noticed, 200.

Gas, our, Monopolies, article on, 278—Comptroller's protest, *ib.*—American toleration of despotism, *ib.*—colloquy between citizen and grand duke, 279—conduct of gas monopolies, *ib.*—unaccustomed to restraint, *ib.*—their indignation when opposed, *ib.*—the Comptroller's duty, 280—how well he does it, *ib.*—Manhattan Gaslight Company, 281—when incorporated, *ib.*—contract with the Corporation, *ib.*—when abrogated, *ib.*—new contract obtained before the expiration of the old, *ib.*—advantages to the company, *ib.*—increased expense to the city, *ib.*—second contract not expired, *ib.*—new contract proposed, *ib.*—advantages

to the monopoly shown by statistics. 282—our gas monopolies compared with those in Europe, *ib.*—more despotic than those of St. Petersburg, *ib.*—compared with those of Paris, London, and Scotland, *ib.*—price of gas at home and abroad, *ib.*—exorbitant prices in New York, *ib.*—attempts of the gas monopolies to evade the internal revenue law, *ib.*—monopolies exacting their own terms, *ib.*—advantage to the stockholders, *ib.*—no adequate results to the consumer, *ib.*—consequences to the poor, *ib.*—New York Company, *ib.*—three gas companies in league with each other, *ib.*—Harlem and Metropolitan agents of the Manhattan, 285—origin and foundation of the power exercised, *ib.*—conditions of the first contract made by the Corporation, *ib.*—rights of the city to control the public streets distinctly recognised, *ib.*—the contract expired by its own limitation, *ib.*—exclusive ownership of the streets reverted to the corporation, *ib.*—importance of this recognition, *ib.*—may be rendered profitable, *ib.*—exercise of these rights recommended, *ib.*—would result in spirited competition, *ib.*—the Street Commissioner, 286.—filthy condition of the city, *ib.*—considerate suggestions in his form of "proposals," *ib.*—comments of the Comptroller thereon, 287—legislation necessary to restrain the monopolies, 288—*modus operandi* of a gas president, *ib.*—his literary performances, 289—specimens, 289–90—inferiority of gas, 291—deleterious effects, *ib.*—opinions of scientific men, 292.

Garioa, La, noticed, 396.

Grahame of Claverhouse and the Covenanters, article on, 259—Mr. Napier's octavos criticised, *ib. et seq.*—Grahame's birth and connections, 261—his education, 262—first sought service under the French king, *ib.*—afterwards with the Stadtholder, William of Orange, *ib.*—saved the life of the Prince, *ib.*—throws up his commission, *ib.*—returns to Scotland, 263—is offered a lieutenancy, *ib.*—friendship with the Marquis of Montrose, *ib.*—is commissioned as colonel, *ib.*—first efforts at suppression of the Covenanters, 267—by whom conducted, *ib.*—military proceedings next entrusted to Claverhouse, *ib.*—Napier's criticism on his conduct, *ib.*—extracts from Grahame's correspondence, 268—justified in obeying the orders of his superiors, *ib.*—Wodrow his chief defamer, 264—Redpath's advice to Wodrow, 270—superstitions of the times, *ib.*—Wodrow's testimony never authenticated, *ib.*—universal execration of Claverhouse, *ib.*—popular condemnation sometimes indicative of guilt, *ib.*—meagreness of reliable testimony, *ib.*—reasons for the same, *ib.*—Claverhouse defeated by the Covenanters, 273—victorious at Bothwell Brigg, *ib.*—his marriage with the daughter of a Covenanter, *ib. et seq.*—becomes a follower of King James, 275—is made Viscount of Dundee, 276—flight of James, *ib.*—receives overtures from Prince William, *ib.*—rejects them, *ib.*—retires to Edinburgh, *ib.*—thence to the Highlands, 277—finds warm adherents, *ib.*—battle of Killiecrankie, *ib.*—death of Claverhouse, 278.

Greeks, Ancient, Oration on, reviewed and criticised, 266, *et seq.*

Ingelow, Jean, her Studies for Stories, noticed 399.

Insurance Report, reviewed, 203–6.

Insurance reports, reviewed and criticised, 396, *et seq.*

Leo X., and his Times, article on, 122—the Medici, *ib.*—Cosmo's, wealth and munificence, *ib.*—his death, 123—Lorenzo de Medici, 123—advancement of Italian literature under his government, *ib.*—Leo X., 124—his early education, *ib.*—precocious intellect, *ib.*—Politian's eulogium, *ib.*—his residence at Pisa, *ib.*—took his seat in the sacred college, 125—Roderigo Borgia, *ib.*—Francesco Piccolomini, *ib.*—Giuliano della Rovere, *ib.*—elegance, luxury, and refinement of Italy during this period, *ib.*—her famous colleges, *ib.*—proficiency in the Greek and Latin languages, 126—Court of Milan *ib.*—Leonardo da Vinci, as an artist and a man, *ib.*—his patrons, *ib.*—death, 127—invasion of Italy, *ib.*—Cardinal de Medici, pontiff, 128—assumes the name of Leo X., *ib.*—accession hailed with delight, *ib.*—gorgeous coronation, *ib.*—reconciliation of the Orsini and Colonni, *ib.*—pacific inclination of Leo X., 129—poetic orations, *ib.*—illustrious monarchs of that age. 130—munificent patronage of scholars, artists, and sculptors, 131—Petro Bembo, *ib.*—his scholastic and personal graces, *ib.*—attachment to Lucretia Borgia, *ib.*—his friends and associates, *ib.*—Leo X. his patron, *ib.*—merits and popularity of his writings, *ib.*—his death, *ib.*—Leo X. as patron of the fine arts, *ib.*—frescoes of Raphael, 133—of Michael Angelo, *ib.*—the "Last Judgment," *ib.*—personal beauty of Raphael, *ib.*—his amiability and generosity, *ib.*—Michael Angelo and Raphael compared, 135—Jacopa Sachelet, 136—the poet Vida, *ib.*—his poem on the game of chess. 137—his reception from Leo X., *ib.*—the "Christiad," and consequent patronage of Clement VII., *ib.*—the women of the times of Leo X., *ib.*—Victoria Colonna, *ib.*—her beauty, talents, and marriage, 138—her widowhood and death. 139—Veronica Gambara, her talents, virtues, and poetical compositions, *ib.*—Ariosto, the glory of his age, *ib.*—the "Orlando Furioso," *ib.*—Nicholas Machiavelli, *ib.*—befriended by the Medici, 141—is imprisoned and tortured, *ib.*—his death, *ib.*—Leo's death, 142—eulogiums, *ib.*

Lives of Familiar Insects, noticed, 202.

Lunar Phenomena, article on, 245—apparently fruitless researches, lead to interesting results, *ib.*—examples cited, *ib.*—earliest instance, *ib.*—observations recorded by Chaldean priests, *ib.*—their results, *ib.*—discoveries in regard to the mean synodic period, *ib.*—how and by whom determined, *ib.*—lunar observations in the ninth century, 246—Halley's discovery, *ib.*—acceleration of the moon's time of revolution, *ib.*—fact verified, *ib.*—interest with which these discoveries were regarded, *ib.*—hypotheses proposed *ib.*—investigation undertaken by Laplace, 247—acceleration of the moon's mean motion accounted for, *ib.*—changes of the earth's orbit anticipated by Leverrier, 248—his theory in regard to the time required for the transmission of gravity, *ib.*—earliest suggestions for finding longitude at sea, by lunar observations, *ib.*—by whom made, *ib.*—lunar observations recommended by Kepler, *ib.*—difficulties to be overcome, *ib.*—rewards offered to encourage discoveries, 249—Tobias Mayer computes the first accurate tables, *ib.*—his death, *ib.*—lunar tables still defective, *ib.*—new discussion of the Greenwich observations undertaken by Mr. Airy, *ib.*—expense to the British government, *ib.*—new inequalities in the lunar motions discovered by Mr. Airy and Hansen, *ib.*—errors in the tables accounted for, *ib.*—phenomena of the moon's disk. *ib.* change of position, *ib.*—variableness of her illuminating power, *ib.*—maps and charts of the lunar disk, *ib.*—by whom executed, *ib.*—depressions

lcanoes, *ib.*—mountains named after mers, *ib.*—Dorfel, *ib.*—Newton, *ib.*—g dissimilarity between terrestrial and mountains, 251—the crater Tycho, appearance, *ib.*—peak of Goatfell, mar solitude and desolation, *ib.*—es pits, *ib.*—remarkable system of h.—different theories in regard to th *ib.*—crater of Copernicus, *ib.*—of Kep-3—the "ring mountains," *ib.*—cra-the moon analogous to those of the *ib.*—Kilauea, *ib.*—peak of Teneriffe, aters of Barren island, *ib.*—and the of Santorini, *ib.*—peculiar configura-coral islands, *ib.*—the Pacific a great s of volcanic action, 254—primitive ance of the earth compared to that moon, *ib.*—changes produced by the pon the earth's surface, *ib.*—pheno-resulting from her disturbing influen-.—appearance of the new moon, *ib.*—by secondary reflection, 255—cause arrow arc of light, *ib.*—the moon's ro-on her axis, *ib.*—when completed, rimitive fluidity of all bodies in the system, *ib.*—how indicated, *ib.*—at-ere of the moon, 256—different theo-regard to its existence, *ib.*—opin-Sir David Brewster, *ib.*—of Sir Wil-Herschel, *ib.*—of Mr. Hind, *ib.*—of or Madler, *ib.*—its density not ex-g that of the exhausted receiver of an mp, *ib.*—cause of the absence of at-ere, *ib.*—light of the full moon com-with that of the sun, 257—heating feeble, *ib.*—experiment by De la Hire, scovery by M. Melloni, *ib.*—moonlight ly calorific, *ib.*—most important dis-of our century, *ib.*—connection be-the moon and tides, *ib.*—suspected by s of antiquity, *ib.*—explained by Sir Newton, *ib.*—beneficial results of these tions, *ib.*—sources of variation in the of the tidal wave, 258—influences pop-ascribed to the moon, *ib.*—supposed upon the human system, *ib.*—upon tion, *ib.*—not substantiated, 259—con-with changes in the weather, *ib.*—substantiated, *ib.*

M and his Maxims of Government, on, 311—books written against him, esign of article, *ib.*—sketch of Machi-s life, 312 *et seq.*—his learning, 314—tions, *ib.*—historical examples and risons, 315—his appointment to the f Secretary, *ib.*—statesmanship, 316—e on the art of war, *ib.*—its character fluence, *ib.*—discourses on Livy, 317 rical works, 318—dramas, *ib.*—most s work, *ib.*—general character of the , 312—its nefarious maxims, 319, *et seq.* Prince advised to ruin his subjects his doing so would be likely to save f, 320, *et seq.*—Cæsar Borgia given odel, 321—Borgia's acts, 322—Princes d not to keep inconvenient promises, he Jesuits blamed for the maxims of velli, 327—his defenders, 328-9—nt opinions of maxims, 330-32—a few maxims true, 333-5—the majority ing, *ib.*

lev. John, his Ecclesiastical History, 1, 200.

, Rev. Dr., his "From Dan to Beer-reviewed and criticised, 169.

and his Times, article on, 1—intellec-periority of the Greek nation, *ib.*—presentative men, 2—Pericles, his and instructors, 3—instructed in to eclipses, *ib.*—his explanation of henomenon to the Athenians, *ib.*—in-cident of the ram's horns, 4—superstitions of the Greeks, *ib.*—eclipse of the moon, 5—disastrous effects, *ib.*—Pericles conceals his learning from the people, *ib.*—his personal appearance, 6—for what distinguished 6—anecdote of Thucydides and Pericles, 7—testimony to the eloquence of Pericles, *ib.*—to his probity and honor, 8—to his influence over the Athenians, *ib.*—the authenticity of orations attributed to Pericles questioned, 9—his modesty, 10—compared with other illustrious men, 11—conversation between Alcibiades and Pericles concerning a law, 13—his pride of country, *ib.*—his public works, 15—sums expended, *ib.*—no taxation, *ib.*—revenue more than sufficient to meet expenses, *ib.*—Pericles as a statesman, *ib. et seq.*—his projects of reforms, 17—trial by jury, *ib.*—not of Saxon origin, *ib.*—Athenian juries, *ib.*—transfer of power from the council to the juries, 18—exasperation of the oligarchical party, *ib.*—Ephialtes assassinated, *ib.*—firmness of Pericles, *ib.*—jealousy of the Spartans, *ib.*—ramparts built, *ib.*—Cimon recalled, *ib.*—Attica saved by Pericles, 19—reproached by his countrymen, *ib.*—defence, *ib. et seq.*—lays siege to Samos, 21—his return and reception, *ib.*—war with the Corcyrians, 21—revolt of Potidæa, 23—irritation of the Athenians, *ib.*—laws passed, *ib.*—Peloponnesian war, 25—successes of the Athenians, *ib.*—the plague, *ib.*—ingratitude of the people, *ib.*—they refuse to re-elect Pericles, *ib.*—his bereavements and grief, 26—his illness, *ib.*—the Athenians repent of their ingratitude, *ib.*—he is re-elected strategos, *ib.*—his mental vigor proved, 27-8—his domestic relations, 29—character of Aspasia, *ib.*—Elpinice, 30—his morality compared with that of our public men, 31.

Petroleum, history, uses, and abuses of, article on, 336—the public warned against being too credulous, *ib.*—different plans of speculators, *ib.*—only safe plan, *ib.*—historical instances of impositions, 337-8—extensive use of petroleum among the ancients, *ib.*—different varieties, 338-9—relative value, 340—numerous companies and enormous capitals, 341—existence of more than one-twentieth part doubtful, 342—exceptions to general character, *ib.*—California Company, 342—Professor Silliman's views, *ib.*—Consolidated Company, 343—Ironsides, *ib.*—companies of loudest pretensions and their "officers," 343, *et seq.*—sketches of *modus operandi*, *ib.*—compared to insurance quacks, 348—the latter less disreputable than the former, *ib.*

Poems, by David Gray, reviewed, 180-3.

Poetry, Italian—Ariosto, article on, 207—Ariosto and his critics, *ib.*—the name to be given to his Orlando Furioso still a subject of dispute, *ib.*—good results arising from discussions, *ib.*—primary cause of, 208—the "Laws" of Aristotle regarded as the test of poetry, *ib.*—Ariosto's chief poem not in accordance therewith, *ib.*—its incongruity, *ib.*—its irregularities regarded as attractions, *ib.*—its defects, 209—would the Orlando be excluded from the epics if fairly judged by the rules of Aristotle? *ib.*—the episodes of Homer, *ib.*—commended by the Stagyrite, *ib.*—the manner in which other epics have been written, *ib.*—the supernatural essential to tragedies, *ib.*—reasons for considering the Orlando Furioso an epic, 210—Ariosto's excesses compared with those of Homer, *ib.*—examples cited, 211—reasons why the Furioso should be regarded as a heroic romance, *ib. et seq.*—belief in necromancy general at

that period, 212—Ariosto compared with Tasso, *ib.*—disputes of the literati in regard to the comparative merits of these favorite authors, 213—disputes not bloodless, *ib.*—decision of the celebrated Accademia della Crusca, *ib.*—Tasso acknowledges the superiority of Ariosto, *ib.*—testimony of Tasso's father, 215–16—early poems, 217—success of his Latin satires and odes, *ib.*—patronage of Cardinal Hippolita, *ib.*—his reception of the Orlando Furioso, 218—his affection for Ariosto, *ib.*—Ariosto's house at Ferrara, 219—his arm-chairs, *ib.*—inkstand, *ib.*—lawsuit, *ib.*—its results, 220—personal appearance, 221—appointed director of the Duke's theatre, 222—the reception of his dramas at home and abroad, *ib.*—gift of the laurel crown, 223—denied by some, *ib.*—town in which the presentation took place a subject of dispute, *ib.*—not dependent upon any emperor for immortality, 224—fond of gardening, *ib.*—testimony of his son Virginio, *ib.*—first thoughts and expressions of prose writers the best, *ib.*—poetry requires the pruning-knife, *ib.*—evidence of Ariosto's careful correction of his works, *ib.*—immense difference between the first and second editions of the Orlando, 225—exact date of Ariosto's birth unknown, *ib.*—year of his death, *ib.*—place of burial, *ib.*—respect to his memory, *ib.*—epitaphs written by himself and others, 226—the Orlando Furioso the continuation of the Orlando Innamorato of Boiardo, 227—analysis of the latter, *ib. et seq.*—great fault of the Orlando Furioso, *ib.*—variety of its themes, *ib.*—three leading subjects, 234—analysis of the Orlando Furioso, *ib. et seq.*—character of Orlando compared with that of Ajax, 240—Ariosto defended from the charge of plagiarism, 241, *et seq*

President's Message, article on, 158—criticism not invidious, *ib.*—secession condemned, *ib.*—to what would the principle of forcible separation lead? *ib.*—considerations due to the South, 160—our armies, 164–5—arbitrary arrests condemned, 166—the loyalty of New York city, 167—terms held out to the South not unreasonable, *ib.*—the resources of the South inferior to those of the North, 168.

Railroad reports, noticed, 405.

Rice, Harvey, his Mount Vernon, reviewed, 337.

Spalding, Martin John, Archbishop, his Pastoral Letter, reviewed, 394, *et seq.*

Spanish Literature: Lope de Vega, article on, 71—intellectual decay of the Spanish, *ib.*—of the Italians, *ib.*—the literature of the sixteenth century contrasted with the present, 73—causes of this decay, *ib.*—influence of the Roman Catholic religion assigned as the cause, *ib.*—Catholic Spain compared with other nations, *ib.*—the most distinguished writers of the golden age Catholics, 74—Luther and other reformers as Catholics, *ib.*—absurdity of accounting for a natural law by attacking any religious sect, 25—influence of the Moors in Spain, *ib.*—effect of intermarriages between the Moors and Spaniards, 76—decline of Spanish literature after the expulsion of the Moors, *ib.*—Lope de Vega of Moorish origin, *ib.*—his precocity, 77—education, *ib.*—early travels, *ib.*—enters the army, *ib.*—is sent to the university of Alcala, *ib.*—falls in love, *ib.*—and into disgrace, 78—w
dramatic romance, Dorothea, *ib*
ception at Madrid, *ib.*—writes th
ib.—his friendship for the Duke
—marriage, *ib.*—duel, 80—separ
his wife, *ib.*—her death, *ib.*—
reviewed, *ib. et seq.*—Hermosu
gelica reviewed, 85, *et seq.*—
marriage, 88—family incidents, *i*
ter Marcela, *ib.*—opinions rega
domestic felicity, 89–90—La
ib.—El Perigrino en su Patria
—El Azero de Madrid noticed,
Principe Perfeto, 94–96—Jerus
quistada analysed, 96–99—The
of Bethlehem noticed, 99—Rel
lads, 100—Lope de Vega b
ecclesiastic, *ib.*—his character a
—Gatomachia, 101–3—multiplici
de Vega's works, 103—his rela
other authors, *ib.*—El Nuovo Mu
El Cuerdo en Casa, 105–6—his ex
as a writer, 106—peculiarities of
language, 107—his rank as an au
his death, *ib.*—burial, *ib.*

Speaker, the American Union, notic

Swedenborg and his new Religion,
349—benefits of studying the
great, *ib.*—general character of Sw
—349 50—sketch of his life, 350,
writings, 351—skilful manœuvr
pointed assessor, 352—philosophi
353-54—illuminations *ib.*—convers
spirits, 356—description of heav
interesting incidents, 358–9—co
with Moses, 361—his manner,
luminous character of his works,
Church doctrines, *ib.*—obscurity
borg's language, 365—discov
truth, *ib.*—his virtues more
than his weaknesses, *ib.*

Stevens, Rev. Abel, his History of
dist Church, reviewed, 378, *et seq.*

St. Winfred's; or, The World of
viewed, 374, *et seq.*

Swift, Jonathan, works of, noticed,

Taney, Chief-Justice, article on, 50
cessors, *ib.*—biographical sketch,
attainments contrasted with th
leading professional men of his
attorney-generalship, and other
connection with the removal of g
deposits to the State banks, 53–
as chief-justice, 54—mental co
ib.—dignity upon the bench,
record, 58—resolution of the bar of
51—his opinions in the Dred Sco
—his views in regard to the con
rights of Africans criticised, *ib.*—
cal opinions, 62—his rank as a judi
man, *ib. et seq.*—compared with
66—case of Merryman, 68—Tane
ship with Andrew Jackson, 69—
ib.—charities, *ib.*—habits, *ib.*—his
found in the philosophy of the la
life during term time, *ib.*—private
character, *ib.*—his friendship, *ib.*—

Von Moschrisker, Dr. Franz Adolph,
tise on Eye, Ear, and Throat Dis
ticed, 404.

Vosburgh, John Henry, his Virginia,
Poems, reviewed, 390, *et seq.*

Voss, Our, noticed, 392–3.

Willis, Nathaniel P., his poems rev
criticised, 138, *et seq.*

THE

NATIONAL

QUARTERLY REVIEW

EDITED BY

EDWARD I. SEARS, A. M., LL. D.

JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1865.

VOL. XI.

"Pulchrum est bene facere reipublicæ, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est."

NEW YORK:
EDWARD I. SEARS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

1865.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1865, by

E. I. SEARS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Southern District of New York.

CONTENTS OF NO. XXI.

ART. PAGE

I. THE CELTIC DRUIDS 1
1. *Celtic Researches on the Origin, Traditions, and Language of the Ancient Britons.* By EDWARD DAVIES, Curate of Olveston, Gloucestershire.
2. *Histoire des Gaulois.* Par AMEDEE THIERRY.
3. *The Celtic Druids.* By GODFREY HIGGINS, Esq., F. S. A.
4. *La Religion des Gaulois.* Par D. MARTIN.
5. *Commentatio de Druidis.* J. G. FRIKIUS.
6. *Ueber die Druiden del Kelten.* VON KARL BARTH.
7. *The Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry.* By J. WILLIAMS.
8. *Les Fées du Moyen Age.* Par ALFRED MAURY.

II. WALLENSTEIN 27
1. *History of the Thirty Years' War.* Translated from the German of FREDERICK SCHILLER. By the Rev. A. J. W. MORRISON, M. A.
2. *The Life of Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland.* By Lieut.-Col. J. MITCHELL, H. P.
3. *The Piccolomini: A Drama in two parts.* Translated from the German of FREDERICK SCHILLER. By S. T. COLERIDGE. (Coleridge's Dramatic Works.)

III. UNITED STATES BANKING SYSTEM, PAST AND PRESENT 51
State Bank System of the United States, 1865.

IV. THE NEW YORK BAR—CHARLES O'CONOR 78
1. *Cowen's Reports.* Vol. vii.
2. *Wendell's Reports.* Vols. ii. and xiv.
3. *New York Reports.* Vols. xv., xx., xxiii., xxiv., xxv.
4. *Howard's Reports.* Vol. x.
5. *Howard's Reports.* Vol. xix.
6. *Debates, New York State Convention.*
7. *Forrest Divorce Case.* 2 vols.

V. PHASES OF ENGLISH STATESMANSHIP 96
Essays on the Administrations of Great Britain, from 1782 to 1830. Contributed to the Edinburgh Review. By the Right Hon. Sir GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart.

VI. MODERN CORRECTORS OF THE BIBLE 119
The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: the Common English Version corrected. By the Final Committee of the American Bible Union.

VII. ANCIENT AND MODERN DISCOVERIES IN MEDICAL SCIENCE 131
1. *Principles of Human Physiology, with their chief application to Psychology, Pathology, Therapeutics, Hygiene, and Forensic Medicine.* By WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M. D., F. R. S., &c.

ART. PAGE.

2. *Clinical Lectures on the principles and practice of Medicine.* By JOHN HUGHES BENNETT, M. D., F. R. S., Professor of Institutes of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh.
3. *Histoire de la Medecine.* Par DANIEL LECLERC.
4. *Histoire de la Medecine depuis son origine jusqu'au dix-neuvieme siècle.*
5. *Institutiones Historiæ Medicinæ.*

VIII. THE LESSONS AND RESULTS OF THE REBELLION 457
Official Despatches and other Public Documents.

IX. NOTICES AND CRITICISMS ..... [illegible]
Education and Science ..... [illegible]
Art 77
History 88
Miscellaneous 95

CONTENTS OF NO. XXII.

Art.		Page.
I.	Lord Derby's Translation of Homer	205
	1. *The Iliad of Homer, rendered into English Blank Verse.* By Edward Earl of Derby.	
	2. Ὅμηρου ἁπαντα : H. E. Homeri *Opera Omnia, ex Recensione et cum notis* Samuelis Clarkii, S.T.P.	
II.	William von Humboldt as a Comparative Philologist	228
	1. *Erinnerungen an Wilhelm von Humboldt.* Von Gustav Schlesier.	
	2. *Wilhelm von Humboldt: Lebensbild und Charakteristik.* Von R. Haym.	
	3. *Wilhelm von Humboldt's gesammelte Werke.* Herausg. von Carl Brandes.	
	4. *Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java.* Von Wilhelm von Humboldt. Herausg. von Carl Buschmann.	
III.	The Wits of the Reign of Queen Anne	251
	1. *English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. M. Thackeray.	
	2. *Life and Works of Jonathan Swift.* By Sir Walter Scott.	
	3. *Lives of the Poets.* By Samuel Johnson.	
	4. *Life of Joseph Addison.* By Miss Lucy Aikin.	
	5. *Lectures on English Literature.* By Henry Reed.	
	6. *Biography of William Congreve.* By Leigh Hunt.	
IV.	American Female Criminals	268
	1. *Reports of various Trials in the principal Cities of the United States, from* 1855 *to* 1865.	
	2. *Women as they are, or the Manners of the Day.* By Mrs. Gore.	
	3. *Privileges of Women.* By Jonah S. Marston.	
	4. *The Poisoners of the Seventeenth Century.*	
	5. *Remarkable Female Criminals.*	
	6. *Des Femmes avant le mariage, pendant le mariage et apres le mariage.*	
V.	The Negative Character of Cicero	297
	1. *M. T. Ciceronis Opera Omnia.*	
	2. *B. G. Niebuhr's Lectures on the History of Rome.* Edited by L. Schmitz.	
	3. *T. Mommsen: Römische Geschichte.*	
	4. *Merivale's History of the Romans under the Empire.*	
	5. *Cicero's Letters to several of his Friends;* translated by W. Melmoth. *Letters to Atticus;* translated by Dr. Hebberden. *Life,* by Dr. Middleton.	
	6. *Cicero.* By Thomas de Quincey.	
	7. *Life and Times of Cicero.* By W. Forsyth.	

VI. The National Debt of the United States..... 82
1. *How our National Debt may be a National Blessing, &c.* By Samuel Wilkeson.
2. *An Inquiry concerning the Rise and Progress, the Redemption and Present State, and the Management of the National Debt of Great Britain.* By Robert Hamilton, LL.D., F.R.S.E.
3. *Elements of a Plan for the Liquidation of the National Debt of Great Britain, &c.* By Richard Heathfield.
4. *Histoire financière de France.—Histoire financière d'Angleterre.* Par M. Bailly.
5. *Du Systeme financier.*

VII. Civilizaton of the Ancient Persians..... 84
1. *The Works of Sir William Jones.*
2. *Institutiones Linguæ Persicæ cum sanscrita et Zendica comparatæ.* J. A. Villiers.
3. *Grammatik der lebenden Persischen Sprache.*
4. *A Grammar of the Persian Language.* By Duncan Forbes.

VIII. Commencements of Colleges and Seminaries..... 86
Annual Catalogues of various Universities, Colleges, Seminaries, &c., &c., 1865.

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XXI.

JUNE, 1865.

ART. I.—1. *Celtic Researches on the Origin, Traditions, and Language of the Ancient Britons, with some Introductory Sketches of Primitive Society.* By EDWARD DAVIES, Curate of Olveston, Gloucestershire. London, 1804.

2. *Histoire des Gaulois.* Par AMÉDÉE THIERRY. Paris, 1845.

3. *The Celtic Druids.* By GODFREY HIGGINS, Esq., F. S. A., of Skellow Grange, near Doncaster, Yorkshire. London, 1827.

4. *La Religion des Gaulois.* Par D. MARTIN. Paris, 1727.

5. *Commentatio de Druidis.* J. G. FRIKIUS. Ulm, 1744.

6. *Ueber die Druiden der Kelten.* VON KARL BARTH. Irlangen, 1826.

7. *The Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry.* By J. WILLIAMS. London, 1844.

8. *Les Fées du Moyen Age.* Par ALFRED MAURY. Paris, 1842.

IT is impossible to estimate the amount of valuable knowledge the world has lost by the unwillingness of certain sects of philosophers to commit the results of their researches to writing. And if this fact be admitted, it must follow that no argument can justify such a course. Few, if any, will dispute that those who avoid recording their discoveries, lest the public at large might have the benefit of them in common with themselves, are guilty of a most reprehensible selfishness; and yet it is to be feared that this has been the prevailing motive. That some have been influenced only by

modesty in avoiding publicity is well known; others have brought valuable truths to the grave with them, rather than seem actuated by vanity or the love of praise. But each have seriously erred. Modesty is indeed a virtue, but when carried to excess it degenerates into a vice. Nor is vanity always culpable or pernicious in its influence; on the contrary, it often, if not always, prompts us to deserve the good opinion which we wish our neighbors to entertain of us. In short, vanity, as well as modesty, has been implanted in us by nature; and it is the abuse, not the use, of her gifts which is injurious. Man is a social being, and as such he should not conceal from his neighbor any knowledge which would benefit him without injuring himself. If he persistently does so, he violates a law of nature, for which he will have to pay the penalty, in one form or other sooner or later.

In no instance has this been more forcibly exemplified than in that of the sects of philosophers who have hoarded up their knowledge as jealously as the miser does his gold. Thus the Druids, who form the subject of our present paper, would have occupied a very different position in history from what they do to-day had they committed their speculations to writing. Because they have failed to do so they are spoken of alternately with contempt and horror by all who lack either the ability or the disposition to investigate their history. The number who do this must ever be small, because all the knowledge we possess as to what the Druids really were is scattered over a wide field, and has to be carefully searched for in every direction. The authors who tell us most of what is reliable about them are seldom read but by the learned. This affords the unscrupulous half learned an opportunity of blackening their character more and more from one lustrum to another, so as to pander to the prejudices of those who regard the Druids as belonging to a different race from their own. Thus, not only does the memory of the Druids suffer at this day more than it did centuries ago, because they failed to vindicate themselves by placing their ideas on record, but the people whose priests and philosophers they were are as much as possible made partakers in their odium.

What our object is in this paper is to show how grossly the Druids have been misrepresented. In doing so, however, we have no intention of representing them as models worthy of imitation. Far be it from us to deny that they had grave faults or to assert that their system of theology, however superior it

was in many respects to other ancient systems, was worthy of comparison with Christianity. But this is no reason why it should be misrepresented as it so generally is. There is a class of writers who sneer at every attempt made to assign to the Druids their proper place in history. If the person making the attempt belongs to any of the countries regarded as Celtic, ridicule is the weapon with which he is assailed. It is assumed that he takes up the subject only because he is a descendant of the race to which the Druids belonged, and he is treated accordingly. His best arguments are to be regarded as so many efforts to glorify himself, although he may exhibit equal zeal, industry, and learning in vindicating the ancient Brahmins or the Magi.

Even first-class journals, distinguished in general for their enlightened liberality and fairness, sometimes forget their character when the present subject comes under their consideration. We have an example of this in a volume of the Edinburgh Review,* in which an article on the Rev. Mr. Davies' *Celtic Researches* commences as follows: "It is amusing to observe with what perseverance and success the Celts are proceeding in their endeavors to deserve that character which has so liberally been bestowed upon them by the most contemptuous of their opponents. Every one must remember the emphatic epithets with which Pinkerton in particular has branded this ill-fated race. According to him a Celtic understanding is *sui generis;* it readily embraces and believes whatever is rejected or laughed at by the rest of mankind. If there be any truth in this description, we think there is great reason to presume that the Celtic writers of the present day, despairing, perhaps, of deriving the general population of Europe from their own illustrious stock, are anxious at least to satisfy the world that they themselves are the genuine descendants of those mighty tribes; and certainly, if strong mental resemblance and striking affinity of disposition may be admitted as presumptive evidence of direct and pure descent, they must be considered as having made good their pretensions." Such is the tone in which a work embodying the careful researches for years of a profound scholar are received by a journal which, for various reasons, ought to be the first to recognise their value. "The Milesian fables of the Irish," continues the same writer, "have long convinced the world more pow-

* Vol. iv., p. 386.

erfully and completely than the most learned and positiv
authorities that they are a legitimate branch of the Celts
The Welsh, though they have been much later in
starting than the Irish, and are even yet less Celtic in thei
creed and character, appear to have lately recovered thei
generic and distinctive credulity in its utmost purity, and,
course, along with their credulity materials for authenti
history as far back as their present dispositions woul
lead them to desire."

Further on the writer proceeds in the same spirit t
prove how absurd and credulous it is to believe that th
Druids possessed any knowledge worthy of notice. A critic
more than any other person, has no right to depend on mer
assertions; if he differs from others, especially from those wh
have devoted much time and study to the subject under co
sideration, he is bound to give his reasons for doing s
Ridicule will answer his purpose only when the argument
or the mode of treatment to which it is applied, are so obv
ously erroneous as to be at variance with common sens
What would be said, for example, of a presiding judge in
court of appeal who would dispose of the most elaborate a
guments of counsel by a mere assertion or sneer? No jud
qualified for his position ever does so. On the contrary,
reasons coolly and dispassionately on the subject, and su
tains his views by quoting authorities. This imparts weig
to his decision; if omitted, it has no weight. Still more e
phatically is all this true of the position of the critic. Su
sneers at Celtic writers as those just quoted might seem
possess some force could it not be shown that th
have said nothing in favor of the Druids, or of t
Celts in general, in which they are not fully sustain
by writers who have no pretensions to a Celtic origi
But the truth is that neither Irish, Welsh, nor Fren
have said more in praise of the Druids than Ge
man writers. This is true, for example, of Professor Bart
of Irlangen University.* If, then, Mr. Davies or Colo
Vallanc ought to be laughed at, so ought Professor Barth a
several other learned Germans; nay, so ought Cæsar, Pli
Ammianus Marcellinus, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, a
Lucans, since all bear testimony to the superior learni
and wisdom of the Druids.

Among the ancients the most reliable writer on the subject

* See his Ueber die Druiden der Kelten, passim.

Cæsar. It cannot be pretended that he had any inducements give the Druids more credit than they deserve; if he can be d to have been actuated by any prejudice, it must have been inst them, since their influence was the most formidable ver he had to contend with in the subjugation of Gaul l Britain. Yet he admits not only that they possessed rning and scientific attainments of a high order, but that Celtic people knew how to appreciate those advantages. "he Druids do not go to war," he says, "nor pay tribute same as the rest; they have exemption from military vice, and a dispensation in all matters. Induced by such at advantages, many embrace this profession of their own ord, and many are sent to it by their parents and relations. ey are said there to learn a great many verses; accordingly ne remain in the course of training twenty years." It d hardly be remarked that none could devote this long iod to study without acquiring a considerable amount of owledge. The illustrious captain shows that it was not want of the means they avoided committing their ideas writing; he tells us that in almost all other matters, in ir public and private transactions, they used Greek letters.* "hat practice," he says, "they seem to me to have adopted two reasons: because they neither desire their doctrines to divulged among the mass of the people, nor those who rn to devote themselves the less to the efforts of memory, ying on writing; *since it generally occurs to most men, that in r dependence on writing they relax their diligence in learning roughly*, and their employment of the memory."† The hor now proceeds to inform us that they were believers

---

Neque fas esse existimant ea literis mandare, quum in reliquis fere rebus licis, privatisque rationabus literis utuntur.—*De Bello Gallico*, L. vi. iii.

That the Druids did use writing, however, is fully proved; although it such as could be understood only by the initiated. The Ogam alphabets undoubtedly Druidical. An inscription in one of these alphabets was d at the beginning of the present century in Ireland. It is known as *Callam Inscription*, and plates of it are given in different works on Celtiquities, including the *Archæological Soc. Ant. Lond.* In commenting his, Dr. Aiken remarks that fifteen lines are required to express the first letters of this alphabet, and that the inscription may be translated in en different ways. Nothing, therefore, can be more uncertain than rue meaning, and consequently nothing could have been better con-d for the purpose of concealing that meaning from the vulgar eye. eral other specimens of Ogam writing exist in different parts of Europe, cially in the British lands. One of the most remarkable and most per-ls that in the library of Trinity College, Dublin; that which ranks in importance and value is in the possession of the Duke of Chandos.

in the immortality of the soul, and that they devoted themselves to scientific pursuits. "They wish," he observes, "to inculcate this as one of their leading tenets, that souls do not become extinct, but pass after death from one body to another; and they think that men by this tenet are in a great degree excited to valor, the fear of death being disregarded. They likewise *discuss and impart to the youth* many things respecting the *stars and their motions, respecting the extent of the world and of our earth, respecting the nature of things;* and respecting the power and the majesty of the immortal gods."*

Now, do not the studies here ascribed to the Druids constitute a system of philosophy as well as of theology? Cæsar found a different system prevailing among the Germans, and he speaks of it accordingly. "The Germans," he says, "differ much from these usages, for they have neither Druids to preside over sacred offices, nor do they pay great regard to sacrifices. They rank in the number of the gods those alone whom they behold and by whose instrumentality they are obviously benefited, namely, the sun, fire, and the moon; they have not heard of the other deities even by report." He shows, upon the other hand, that there were many features in the mythology of the Gauls which were identical with those most prominent and most refined in the mythologies of Egypt, Greece, and Rome. This great disparity between the ancient Celts and Goths, as described by authentic historians, who had no interest in misrepresenting either race, is very distasteful to that class of writers who would fain trace every good quality as well as every valuable idea we possess to a Gothic source. It is these who would represent the Druids as savages, and all who would attempt to vindicate them as credulous and silly.

Of all the Roman historians, none is more impartial or more faithful in his narrative than Marcellinus. Gibbon takes leave of him with regret as "an accurate and faithful

---

* Les Druides formaient la classe supérieure et savante de l'ordre sacerdotal; ils s'adonnaient à l'étudé des hautes sciences philosophiques, physiques et religieuses; ils êtaient chargés de l'éducation publique et revêtus du pouvoir judiciaire.—M. Alfred Maury, *Cyclopédie Moderne*, art. Druidism.

† Maury, who has fully investigated the subject, entirely concurs in Cæsar's estimate of the German system. "Les Germains," he says, "peuple si voisin des Gaulois, et en relation fréquente avec eux, n'avaient, de l'aveu même de César, que ce fétechisme pour religion, et la théologie *plus profonde des Druides leur était inconnue.*"—*Art. Druidism.*

uide, who has composed the history of his own times with-
ıt indulging the prejudices and passions which usually
fect the mind of a contemporary." And what does the
storian thus spoken of tell us about the Druids? Does he
eer at them, or denounce them as savages? Let the histo-
an himself answer, and let Him also give us his estimate of
e Bards and Eubages, nay, of the Celtic people in general,
ıly premising that if a Welshman, an Irishman, or any one
ıpposed to be Celtic himself, had spoken in similar terms, he
ould be laughed at as a credulous dupe by the class of
riters alluded to. After speaking in general terms of the
elts and their influence on the countries of which they took
ossession, Marcellinus proceeds to inform us that, 'through-
ıt these provinces, the people gradually becoming civilized,
he study of liberal accomplishments flourished, *having been
irst introduced by the Bards, the Eubages, and the Druids.* The
Bards were accustomed to employ themselves in celebrating
the brave achievements of their illustrious men in *epic verse*,
accompanied with sweet airs on the lyre. The Eubages
investigated the system and sublime secrets of nature, and
sought to explain them to their followers.* Between these
two came the Druids, *men of loftier genius*, bound in brother-
hoods according to the precepts and example of Pythagoras;
and *their minds were elevated by investigations into secret and sub-
lime matters*, and *from the contempt which they entertain for human
affairs they pronounced the soul immortal.*"†

We think few will deny that the really credulous and silly are those who represent men of this character as savages. All we learn from authentic history of the Celtic Bards alone would show, from their connection, as an order, with the Druids, that the latter must have been men who would be considered learned in any age or country.‡ It is not strange that those who ridicule the Druids also ridicule the Bards, and represent them either as myths or as ignorant ballad-mongers, like those who sing in the streets for the entertainment of the peasantry at the fairs throughout Europe. They

* Eubages scrutantes seria et sublimia naturæ pandere connabantur. Inter hos Druidos ingeniis celciores, &c.

† The Roman History of Ammianus Marcellinus, B. xv., c. ix.

‡ Those who have devoted most attention to the subject do not hesitate to believe that the Druids had regular academies: "Academia auplissima estimatur fuisse in sylva Carnotensi, eo loco ubi nunc urbs a Druidibus nuncupata Gallice Dreux, et in Pagis sylvæ vicinis (ut Rovillardus) Druidarum domus dicuntur: et non procul Augustoduno (ubi imagines Druidarum de Montfaucon erutæ sunt) altera Academia in Monte Gallice Montedue.—Frikius, *Commentatio de Druidis*, p. 147.

Pliny calls the Druids the Gaulish Magi—*Nat. Hist.*, lib. xvi., c. xliv., *sub finem.*

either forget that they were men like Ossian, or they deny that the latter had any other existence as a poet than that which has been bestowed upon him by Macpherson. In other words, whatever theory is unfavorable to the Celts, their Bards, or their Druids, is readily accepted as truth, while whatever has the opposite tendency is scoffed at as absurd and ridiculous. Diodorus informs us that the Bards, or sacred poets, of the Celts chanted on the national instrument (the harp) the exploits of their heroes, and stigmatized in their hymns the cowardly; that they accompanied their chiefs to battle, and that their person as well as their character was inviolable. Such was their influence that frequently during the civil wars in Gaul they caused the immediate cessation of bloodshed among the most furious of the combatants by simply calling on them to desist.* In speaking of the same order, M. Alfred Maury remarks that they were at once the military heralds, the legislators, and the poets of the Celts. Each prince or chief of a tribe had his own bard, who ranked with the first officers of his court. They were exempt both from taxes and military service, even when their country was in most imminent danger. When they accompanied their chiefs to battle, as already observed, for the purpose of celebrating their exploits, they were furnished with a body-guard to protect them from the enemy; and in all public assemblies and fêtes they occupied the post of honor next to their chiefs. Besides being splendidly entertained in the castle to which they were attached, they received valuable presents.†

None aware of these well-attested facts are disposed to doubt the genuineness of the best of the poems attributed by Macpherson to Ossian. History informs us also that much honor and influence as the bards possessed, they deserved both, even in their degenerate days, when they had no longer the same means of improving their minds and acquiring knowledge, which they formerly had, but were persecuted

---

* Diod. Sic., v. 31, p. 354.

† If Maury be objected to because a Frenchman and consequently Celtic, it can hardly be pretended that Gibbon was prejudiced in favor of the Celts or their priests. In speaking of the Bards he makes the following remarks:—"That singular order of men have *most deservedly* attracted the notice of all who have attempted to investigate the antiquities of the Celts, the Scandinavians, and the Germans. *Their genius and character, as well as the reverence paid to that important office, have been sufficiently illustrated.* But we cannot so easily express, or even conceive, the enthusiasm of arms and glory which they kindled in the breast of their audience."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1, p. 291, New York, 1860.

wherever they showed themselves. Even so late as the close of the thirteenth century their influence was felt by rulers disposed to oppress their subjects. Thus the historian relates with horror and indignation that when Edward I. was wearied with the prolonged independence of the Celtic tribes, he caused their Bards to be assembled and massacred—an atrocious and cruel act, which has been justly compared to that of Ægisthus of old, who, when, desiring to corrupt Clytemnestra, caused the minstrel placed near her by Agamemnon as a protector of her virtue to be put to death. One of the finest efforts of Gray, the poet, is the ode inspired by this massacre, and in which he introduces a bard, who, from the top of a rock beaten by the waves, devotes to destruction the crowned assassin, predicting for him all the misfortunes of his race, and terminates his imprecations by precipitating himself into the waves.*

Now be it remembered that the Bards were Druids, but belonged only to the second, or, as some think, to the third order of that learned and powerful body. Most historians concur in giving all credit for the noblest patriotism. "They were the most strenuous assertors of their country's liberty against the Romans," says Mr. Higgins, "constantly exciting their countrymen, after every defeat, to fresh insurrections. This was the true reason why they were, in a particular manner, sought after by the Romans and put to the sword whenever they could be taken. So determined were they, that neither by the Romans, Danes, nor Normans could they ever be conquered, either in Britain or Ireland; but as they could not successfully resist the overwhelming numbers and superior discipline of their enemies in the plain country, they retreated, with the highest-spirited and most intractable of their countrymen, into the mountains of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, where they successfully defied the legions of the Roman and Saxon barbarians."†

*The following lines will give those who may not have read the poem an idea of the combined spirit of sympathy for the Bard, and indignation against the exterminator, in which it is written:

"On a rock whose haughty brow
Frowns o'er old Conway's foaming flood,
Rob'd in the sable garb of woe,
With haggard eyes, the poet stood;
(Loose his beard, and hoary hair,
Streamed like a meteor to the troubled air)
And with a master's hand and prophet's fire
Struck the deep sorrows of his lyre.
'Hark, how each giant oak, and desert cave,
Sighs to the torrent's awful voice beneath!
O'er thee, oh king, their hundred arms they wave,
Revenge on thee in hoarser murmurs breathe;
Vocal no more since Cambria's fatal day [*Pindaric ode.*
To high-born Hoel's harp, or soft Llewellyn's lay.'"—*The Bard; a*

†The Celtic Druids, p. 275.

Those who wish to depreciate the Druids because th did not belong to "the Anglo-Saxon race," triumpha ask, Why did they not at least leave us some fine specimens architecture, if they were the ingenious and cultivated peo which their Celtic admirers represent them? Their archit ture is, indeed, not distinguished for its beauty, but it is d tinguished for its rude grandeur and sublimity. But is t this rudeness inconsistent with the character assigned them? This by no means follows. It is more likely th a people who were unwilling to commit their discoveri either in the arts or sciences to writing had no ambition t erect fine edifices; especially when it is borne in mind tha the groves were their favorite temples. Little doubt is no entertained, however, that Stonehenge in Wiltshire, England is a Druidical work. "If I talk to you of a Doric, Ionic, o Corinthian temple," observes Mr. Higgins, "you will readil form such an idea of the building in your mind as to be surprise on seeing it, for each of these orders has its fixed proportions and each its appropriate ornaments; but were I to describ to you a rude temple composed of four circles, one within th other, with upright stones twenty feet high, and others of a immense size placed across them like architraves, I fear m description would prove very unsatisfactory." Of a simila character is the temple of Abury. A full description either would fill the space designed for our whole articl Fortunately nothing of the kind is necessary; the structur alluded to are so famous as curiosities that there are few, any, of our readers who are not acquainted with the character.* That stones are rude and plain is no eviden that those who raised them were not acquainted with th science of architecture. We have abundant testimony tha in ancient times it was deemed an impiety, if not a sacrileg to use any tools on structures designed for the worship God. Even the inspired historians testify to this fact. Thu in the 27th chapter of Deuteronomy and 5th verse, th following command is given: "And there shalt thou bui an altar unto the Lord thy God, an altar of stones; *thou sha not lift up any iron tool upon them.*" In the following verse is added, "Thou shalt build the altar of the Lord thy God

* "We remark here," says a learned writer, "a very striking resem blance between the ancient places of devotion in Greece and the Druidic temple of the more northern countries. In short, the astonishing remai at Stonehenge present the best known, and perhaps the most stupendous e amples ever erected of the open temple."—*Mimes. Hist. of Sculpture,* & p. 225.

whole stones." The temples of the Druids were circular; and so were those of all the Eastern nations, including the Jews.

The most learned archæologists of the present day are of opinion that the round towers found in all countries known to have been inhabited by the Celts, but chiefly in Ireland, are of Druidical origin. This view of the case is, indeed, nothing new; the same opinion was entertained centuries ago. Nay, the only reason why all archæologists who investigated the subject did not give the credit of those curious structures to the Druids from the beginning, is that nearly all have crosses on them. From this fact it has been taken for granted that they were built by the early Christians; but the researches made in different countries during the last century have proved this to be an erroneous conclusion. It has been found that the cross has been used as a sacred symbol in all parts of the world from the earliest records. "Let not the piety of the Catholic Christian be offended," says the Rev. Mr. Maurice, "at the preceding assertion, that the cross was one of the most usual symbols *among the hieroglyphics of Egypt and India.* Equally honored in the Gentile and Christian world, this emblem of universal nature, of that world to whose four quarters its diverging radii pointed, decorated the hands of most of the sculptured images in the former country, and in the latter stamped its form upon the most majestic of the shrines of their deities.*

All Egyptologists that can be regarded as authorities concur in the opinion that it was a sacred emblem among the Egyptians. They remind us how Ibis was represented with human hands, holding the staff of Isis in one hand and a globe and cross in the other. The cross is found on most of the Egyptian obelisks. Nor was it by any means unknown either in the Greek or Roman mythology. In almost all the old monograms of Jupiter he is represented as bearing a cross with a horn; and the most common we have of Saturn is a cross and a ram's horn. There is now in the British Museum a medal of Ptolemy, King of Cyrene, the most conspicuous figure on which is a cross. It is a well-attested historical fact, that when one of the Christian emperors demolished the temple of Serapis at Alexandria, a monogram of Christ was discovered beneath the foundation. The Rev. Mr. Maurice and others inform us that the two principal pagodas of India, namely those of Benares and Mathusa, are built in the form of a cross.†

* Indian Antiquities, vol. ii., p. 861. † Ib.

In different parts of ancient Mexico the same sacred emblem is to be found; the most remarkable is that among many others in the ruins of a fine Tulteque city near Palenque. On the top of the cross is a likeness of Ceres, to which a devotee is making an offering of an infant.* Many other instances might be given, but these will suffice for our present purpose. What is more important, however, in connection with the subject under consideration, is the fact that the cross was also used by the Druids as a sacred emblem. If this can be proved, there will no longer be any good reason to deny that it was they who built the round towers. The learned Dr. Schedius, in his *De Moribus Germanorum*,† tells us that the Druids "seek studiously for an oak tree, large and handsome, growing up with two principal arms, *in the form of a cross*, beside the main stem, upright. If the two horizontal arms are not sufficiently adapted to the figure, they fasten a *cross-beam* to it. This tree they consecrate in this manner: Upon the right branch they cut in the bark, in fair characters, the word *Hesus;* upon the middle or upright stem the word *Taramis;* upon the left branch *Belenus;* over this, above the going off of the arms, they cut the name of God, *Thau;* under all, the same, repeated, *Thau.* This tree, so inscribed, they make their *kebla* in the grove cathedral, or summer church, towards which they direct their faces in the offices of religion, as to the ambre-stone or the cove in the temples of Abury."

At first sight it might seem that the pious Christian should be unwilling to believe that the cross was so universally used as a sacred emblem long before the birth of Christ; but a little reflection shows that he should, on the contrary, rather regard it as an additional proof, if any were needed, of the truth of Christianity. It would be as absurd to feel dissatisfied on learning that the cross was thus venerated throughout the world—even in China—as it would be to be dissatisfied with the prophecies in the Old Testament, in which the coming and sacrifice of Christ are foretold. Still less reason have we for dissatisfaction, or rather still more reason have we to believe in the divine origin of Christianity, when we reflect that there is no symbol of importance which the Druids possessed in common with ourselves which they did not also possess in common with the Jews.

The latter, too, used the cross; and there is good reason

*Description of an Ancient City of Mexico, by Felix Cabrara. London, 1822.
† C. xxiv.

to believe that they also regarded the oak as a sacred tree. The learned Skelton tells us, in his comments on the eighth and ninth chapters of Ezekiel that, "In the hearing of the prophet the Lord, or Christ, commanded the man in linen to go through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark, namely the letter *Thau*, which answers to T in our alphabet, upon the foreheads of all that sighed and bewailed the abomination done in that city; and then commanded the other five to follow him and all the rest, *but not to come near those that were marked*. Thus stands the passage in Hebrew. But why the particular letter or mark is not set down in our translation, we do not know, unless because the Jews and Samaritans have changed the shape of the letter, which we know they did since the days of Ezekiel. Certain it is, however, that St. Jerome, at once the most learned and judicious of all the Eastern Fathers, has observed that the letter, in the true ancient Hebrew alphabet, was a cross +. It is to us equally certain that the mark which the servants of God were ordered to receive in their foreheads (Rev. vii.) was a +, so early given to every Christian at admittance into the Church, pursuant to our Saviour's command. How it came to pass that the Egyptians, Arabians, and Indians, before Christ came among us, and the inhabitants of the extreme northern part of the world, ere they had so much as heard of him, paid a remarkable veneration to the sign of the cross, is to me unknown; *but the fact itself is known*. In some places this was given to men accused of crime, but acquitted; and in Egypt it stood for the signification of eternal life."*

Now, as to the veneration of the ancient Hebrews, as well as the Druids, for the oak, nothing is more clearly proved from Scripture. Thus, we read that Jacob hides the teraphim, the idols of his wife, "under the oak by Shechem," his object being, no doubt, to remove her sin by depositing them in a sacred place. We read that Saul and his sons were interred "under the oak in Jabesh," and that Deborah, Rebecca's foster-mother, was buried with pious care "beneath the stones of Bethel, under an oak," and the name of it was called "The Oak of Weeping." In Joshua we read that the inspired successor of Moses "took a great stone and set it up there, *under an oak*, which was by the sanctuary of the Lord."† We learn from Genesis‡ that Abraham planted a grove

* Appeal to Common Sense, p. 45.
† C. xxiv. v. 26. ‡ xxi., 33.

at Beersheba, where he invoked the Everlasting God, in the name of Jehovah. We are subsequently informed* that Isaac invoked the name of Jehovah in this grove. If it be true that in time the Druidical worship degenerated into idolatry, it is equally true of the Hebrew worship; for we find Ezekiel, Hosea, and Isaiah warmly expostulating with their apostate countrymen for "worshipping idols under every thick oak." But the worst charge against the Druids is that they indulged in human sacrifices. The testimony of Cæsar on this point is unequivocal. He tells us that "those who are troubled with unusually severe diseases, and those who are engaged in battles and dangers, either sacrifice men as victims, or vow that they will sacrifice them, and employ the Druids as the performers of those sacrifices; because they think that unless the life of a man be offered for the life of a man, the mind of the immortal gods cannot be rendered propitious, and they have sacrifices of that kind ordained for national purposes Others have figures of vast size, the limbs of which, formed of oziers, they fill with living men, which being set on fire, the men perish enveloped in flames. They consider that the oblation of such as have been taken in theft, or in robbery, or any other offence, is more acceptable to the immortal gods; but when a supply of that class is wanting they have recourse to the oblation of even the innocent."

There is good reason to believe that Cæsar, or any of the Roman writers who have made the same charge, have not done justice to the Druids in this respect. Eminent investigators, belonging to different nations, utterly deny the accusation, and maintain that it was first made in order to palliate, if it could not justify, the atrocious cruelties practised on the Druids by the Romans on account of their persistent and formidable resistance to the invaders of their country.†

All the authentic information we have relative to the Druids is utterly inconsistent with the savage cruelty thus attributed to them by their enemies. Most writers who have devoted any attention to their history give them credit for an excellent system of morality. Diogenes Laertes in-

* Genesis, xxvi., 25.

† Under the specious pretext," says Gibbon, "of abolishing human sacrifices the emperors Tiberius and Claudius suppressed the *dangerous power* of the Druids."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1, p. 38. See also Seuton. in Claud., and Pliny Hist. Nat. xxx.

forms us that their leading maxims were, *To honor the gods, To do evil to no one,* and *To exhibit courage in danger.** Those who believe in the metempsychosis and the immortality of the soul, as all agree the Druids did,† are not likely to sacrifice the lower animals, not to mention their fellow-creatures. It is well known that the Hindoos, who entertain the same faith, are opposed to the killing of any animal whatever when it can be avoided. There is good reason to believe that the dogma of the transmigration of souls had its origin in an effort to prevent needless cruelty, even to the humblest of the lower animals. Many think this was the chief object of Pythagoras. At all events, the best modern authorities acquit the Druids of the odious charge. The learned Dr. Smith is of opinion that they never sacrificed any animals. He says that in the Gaelic language, customs, or traditions, which he has fully investigated, there is not a hint allusive to the sacrifice of any living being. "This silence," he remarks, "with regard to these is the more remarkable, as not only the distant allusions, but even the practice of some of their other sacrifices, have still some existence in several parts of North Britain. These consist of a libation of flour with eggs, and some few herbs and simples."‡ To this he adds the remark that the Gaelic name for sacrifice confirms his opinion. *Tob oirt,* from *iob* or *uile,* a raw cake or lump of dough, and *thoirt,* to offer, the *th* quiescent; but when they did offer a living sacrifice, if ever they did, it consisted of some noxious animal, as the wild *boar.*§

Indeed, this is the opinion of all modern investigators, save those who have an antipathy to all orders of priesthood. Mr. Higgins, for example, pronounces the Druids guilty, but he would have no priests innocent, as may be seen from the following remark: "If it be thought right to retain a priesthood in a government like ours (the British), where the good of the governed is the first object, it can never be kept within its just bounds *with too much severity,* nor its petty but increasing exertions to aggrandise the order be too vigorously repressed. For my own part, I am inclined to the opinion of the Society of Friends, that orders of priesthood have been

* See *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymri,* by Rev. J. Williams, p. 40.

† Even Cæsar bears unequivocal testimony to their belief in that dogma: "In primis," he says, "hoc volunt persuadere, non interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem transire ad alios putant."—*De B. G. L.* vi.

‡ Smith's History of the Druids, ch. ii., p. 36.

§ See Strabo., lib. iv.; also Macrob., *Saturnal.* lib. vi., ch. ix.

more prejudicial than useful to the religion of Jesus, &c.* One who speaks of the Christian ministers of all sects in the terms can hardly be expected to acquit the Druids, sin they also were priests. The testimony of one entertaini such an opinion would not be received in a court of justi against priests; even a juryman must be without prejudi in order to agree to a fair verdict; if he admits that he prejudiced, the accused has a right to reject him.

As we, however, have no object in the discussion but to tablish the truth—as we want to conceal nothing that has be alleged on any plausible grounds against the Druids—we w give the views of those who have taken the most pains to c vict them, only premising that they, too, are opposed to priests. This is true, for example, of Dr. Borlase, wh views of them are not unlike those of Lucretius, thou they are not expressed so openly. The following accou of the Druidical sacrifices should, therefore, be rece ed with a certain degree of allowance for that fa "Their victims were of several kinds. Sometimes beas as at the gathering of the mistletoe, two white bulls but especially beasts taken from their enemies in war; ho ever, their more solemn sacrifices consisted of human v tims, and it cannot be dissembled that the Druids were tremely lavish of human blood. Not only criminals, captiv and strangers were slain at their sacrifices, but their v disciples were put to death without mercy if they were v fully tardy in coming to their assemblies. No people, ho ever, could, I think, have wrought themselves up to suc total contempt of human life and the body of man, who l not, at the same time, the most elevated notions of the s and the most certain persuasion of futurity; but t instead of being their excuse, will only show us how greatest truths may be made the occasion of the most ho sins, where proper notions of the Deity do not obtain, where truth, and reason, and philosophy are permitted be built upon by the father of error. The Druids h several opinions which contributed to confirm them in dreadful custom. For the redemption of the life of m they held that nothing but the life of man could be accep by the gods; and the consequence of this was that th who implored safety from the dangers of war, or the m desperate distempers, either immediately sacrificed so

* *The Celtic Druids*, p. 292. †Pliny xiv. 144.

reature, or made a vow to do so soon after. Their crifices generally consisted of such criminals as victed of theft, or any capital crime; and some of been sacrificed after an imprisonment of five years; such malefactors were not at hand, the innocent their place. They held that man was the most* and therefore the most grateful victim which they r to their gods; and the more dear and beloved erson, the more acceptable they thought the offer- n would be accounted. Hence, not only beautiful and strangers†, but princes, and the first-born of children, were, upon great and interesting occa- red upon their altars. Nature, it seems, was silent, ot say, with the prophet Micah,‡ "Shall I give my for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the soul?" In order to satisfy the scrupulous of the of such barbarous sacrifices, and to reconcile the victim to his fate, the Druids held that the souls who served as victims to their gods in this life ed. or at least translated into heaven to be happy d the remains of those who died in sacrifice were most holy, and honored before any other dead Variety of deaths they had for those miserable s if they had been afraid that they should fall into g and dislike of such sacrifices if they confined s to one particular manner of despatching them. y shot to death with arrows; others they crucified mples; some were impaled in honor to their gods, with many others, who had suffered in a different vere offered up as a burnt sacrifice. Others were ath, and their blood, being received in basins, served le their altars. Some were stabbed to the heart, e direction in which (after the fatal stroke) the body r to the right or left, forward or backward, by the n of the limbs, and by the flow of blood, the Druids lition there is in butchery!) might foretell what was "One Druid sacrifice was still more monstrous. They ge image of straw; the limbs of it were joined to- nd shaped by wicker-work: this sheath, or case, with human victims; and Strabo adds, 'with wood d several kinds of wild beasts,' imagining, perhaps,

d. Sic.
ace, lib. iii., ode iv.
‡ Ch. vi., v. 7.
§ Rel. des Gaulois, vol. ii., p. 226.

that by a variety of expiring groans and howlings they might terrify their gods into a compliance with their solicitations to this image they set fire, consuming that and the enclosed at one holocaust. In what shape this image of straw was made Cæsar does not say, but probably it was in that of a bull; for they used to sacrifice bulls,* and carried to war with them the image of a bull; and the bull is one of the largest and most capacious of the brute kind, and therefor the fittest for such a dreadful office. Whilst they were performing these horrid rites, the drums and trumpets sounded without intermission, that the cries of the miserable victim might not be heard or distinguished by their friends, it being accounted very ominous if the lamentations of either children or parents were distinctly to be heard whilst the victim was burning. The victim being offered, they most solemnly prayed to the gods with uplifted hands and great zeal; and when the entrails had been properly examined by the Diviners, Pliny thinks that the Druids ate part of the human victim; what remained was consumed by the last fire upon the altar; intemperance in drinking generally closed the sacrificing; and the altar was always consecrated afresh by strewing oak-leaves on it before any sacrifice could be offered upon it again."†

We have already remarked how inconsistent all this with the general character of the Druids. All that relates to them besides, either in history or tradition, has a very different tendency. The best authorities give the Druids credit for those harmless, and often beautiful, fairy tales found amongst the traditions of all Celtic nations.‡ In not one of these tales that we have ever heard is there anything bloody or cruel, except that the fairies are sometimes represented as inflicting punishment in the end on those mortals who made love to them and gained their affections. And it is easy to understand that the object of this is to exercise a salutary restraint on the credulous and superstitious.

In Ireland especially, the fairies—believed to be remnants of the Druidic system—are distinguished for their humane and friendly offices. This is true, for example, of the *banshee*, who is said to cry in the most piteous and heart-rending man-

* Plin., v. xiv. 44. † Antiquities of Cornwall, pp. 127–9.

‡ "Mais ce sont les *sithich* des traditions Welches," says Alfred Maury, "qui rappellent d'avantage les druids, les druidesses, et le vieux culte gaulois. Leur nom qui signifie *paci facteurs*, semble un titre emprunté à ces prêtres. Leurs femmes s'appellent *ban-druidh, ban-fhiosaiche*, femmes druides, femmes savantes, etc."

at the death of any member of particular families; no is more firmly believed by the peasantry in all parts of country than this. The worst conduct attributed to the es is that they like to take good and handsome human gs to themselves, especially infants and young girls, and e some of their own kind in their stead. As for blood-, there is no evidence of their taking any delight in it; he contrary, the universal tradition is that it is a poison iem, but that they like milk, flour, barley-meal, eggs, &c.

But if we assume the worst, and admit that there was a when the Druids really did sacrifice human victims, is ything worse for them to have done so than for the Jews, Greeks, the Romans, the Carthaginians, and the Etrus-? These are admitted to be the greatest nations of the h. If they were not savages because they sacrificed hu- beings, why were the Druids? In other words, if the s were a barbarous and inferior people because their sts immolated human victims, were not the Greeks, Ro-s, &c., equally barbarous and inferior, since it is indispu- e that they did the same? Nothing is more plainly rded in the Scriptures than that the Jews sacrificed human ims; although it seems evident that Moses did all he could liscourage the practice. The sacrifice of the daughter ephthah is familiar to all. It is related as follows by the ed historian: "And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the LORD. said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of mon into mine hands, then it shall be, that whatsoever ieth forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I rn in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be LORD'S, and I will offer it up *for a burnt-offering*." "And ime to pass at the end of two months, that she returned her father, who *did with her according to his vow which he vowed*."* We also read in Exodus,† "Thou shalt not de- to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: *the born of thy sons* shalt thou give unto me." When Sodom devoted to destruction by the Lord, Abraham did his to save it; but when called upon to sacrifice his own Isaac, he seems to have made no objection, which would n to imply that he regarded such a sacrifice as at least uncommon.

There is but too much evidence that even the Jews of

* Judges xi., 30–31, 39. † Exodus xxii., 29.

modern times have always believed in the efficacy of human sacrifices as a means of conciliating the divine favor. An instance or two of what they have done in Christian times will sufficiently explain this. Thus, we read that at a solemnization of the Passover at Paris in 1080 A. D., they sacrificed a youth, the son of a rich merchant, for which the criminals were executed, and all Jews were banished from France. Nine years after, on the coronation day of Richard I., a large number of them were massacred in the city of London for a similar crime. In 1235, they attempted to crucify a child at Norwich, England; in this instance it was deemed most advisable to make them pay the penalty in money; and accordingly the offenders were fined 20,000 marks. This did not restrain them, however, for they immolated a child (on the cross) in Lincoln in 1255, and at Northampton in 1282. For the former eighteen were hanged, and for the latter fifty were drawn at horses' tails and hanged.

We have no disposition to speak harshly of the Jews, or any other sect; all we want is to vindicate the truth of history. When Israelites tell us that there is no Christian country, with the exception of America, in which they have not been cruelly oppressed, and that they have been tortured in every conceivable manner on account of their religion, it is but just to remember that it is not because they were Jews, or because they believed in the Old Testament, but because they would persist in human sacrifices, and in cheating their Christian neighbors. Now, how deeply rooted must be the faith which will prompt those who entertain it to suffer the teeth to be pulled out of their heads, to be quartered and hanged, or be banished forever from their homes, rather than abandon it! If the ancient Celts were taught the same doctrine by their priests, why did they discard it so easily? Is it characteristic of them to do so? What they were taught, *i.e.* the harmless belief in fairies, *banshees*, &c., is still retained to a considerable extent by their descendants among the Irish and Scottish peasantry.

All writers of any note on the subject of mythology concur in the opinion that it was customary among the Greeks, Romans, and Carthaginians to offer human sacrifices to Saturn. From this it is inferred by some that he was identical with Moloch, the Phœnician deity, to whom the apostate Jews sacrificed their offspring. He is generally represented by the Greeks as a "decrepit old man, with a long beard and hoary head; his shoulders are bowed like an arch,

ıws hollow, his cheeks sunk; his nose is flat, his ːad full of furrows, and his chin turned up; his right holds a rusty scythe, and his *left a child, which he is about your.*" Every intelligent reader is familiar with acrifice of Iphigenia.* Nor need we go so far in Grecian history as the Homeric times to find in-ːs of human sacrifice. When Athens was at the ian of her glory as the intellectual capital of the world, of her greatest men are said to have immolated their r-creatures. Plutarch, who never intentionally misre-ıts anything, but is justly regarded as the most reli-ıf all the Greek historians, informs us that Themistocles ced several of the Persian captives to the gods.†

he Romans were not as superstitious as the Greeks, and ore did not indulge so much in human sacrifices; but they did immolate human beings, on important occa-is beyond doubt. If we had no historical testimony of ct, the bas-reliefs still extant would abundantly prove Ve see in these a large variety of instruments and vessels ı were used exclusively in sacrifices; such as the knife, which the victim was stabbed; the broad dishes, or ı (*paterœ*), which held the blood; the vessels to hold ıtrails, &c. Various sacrificial apparatus are exhibited e sculptures found in Pompeii. One figure represents ıcred fillet (*vitta*), sometimes suspended from the neck

---

ə of the finest passages in the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus is that in which ribes the victim preparing for the sacrifice, and which Blackie has ted as follows:

"So now in act to speak the virgin stands:
But when, the third libation paid,
She heard her father's dread commands
Enjoining silence, she obeyed;
And for her country's good,
With patient, meek, submissive mind,
To her hard fate resigned,
Poured out the rich stream of her blood."

ə Themistocles in Lives.

e have abundance in every form; but for our present purpose it will cient to refer to the pages of Livy, who is the least likely of all the authors to misrepresent his countrymen on so important a subject. l us that because two of the Vestal virgins were guilty of unvestal-nduct, one was buried alive and the other forced to commit suicide; tners in their guilt were disposed of in a manner equally summary. st all this might not be sufficient, the Decemviri caused the sacred ːo be examined; and the result was that a male and a female Gaul nale and a female Greek—persons who had nothing whatever to do ıe sins of the vestals—were buried alive, as an atonement to the of-gods.—"Interim ex fatibus libris sacrificia aliquot extraordinaria inter *quæ Gallus et Galla, Græcus et Græca,* in foro boario *sub terra missi sunt* in locum saxo conseptum, jam ante hostiis humanis minime ıo sacro, imbutum."—*Tit. Liv.*, lib. xxii., cap. 57.

of the victim; another a pitcher for holding the blood, &c. One of the most remarkable as well as most unequivocal is a sculpture which represents a magistrate in his robe engaged in a sacrifice; he holds in his hand a *patera;* the victim is led forward by the *popa* or *cultrarius*, who is naked to his waist, with a wreath on his head; behind the magistrate is a boy holding a vase or pitcher, and an older servant holding a platter; by his side is a musician playing the flute, followed by lictors with their *fasces;* in the background appear the pillars of the temple decorated with garlands.*

But we need not go among either the Jews or pagans in search of persons who have been guilty of human sacrifices. It needs but little research to find such even in Christian times. Mr. King has pointed out an instance of a human sacrifice by Einar, Thane of Caithness, of Haldanus, Prince of Norway, so late as the tenth century.† But who would attribute the odium of this to Christianity? There is nothing to which the religion of Christ is more opposed; it was to obviate the necessity of any such sacrifices forever after, that he offered himself up once for all. Yet a historian, having an antipathy to priests, writing centuries hence, may accuse Christianity of having immolated human victims. Have not writers like Voltaire and D'Holback imputed worse to it, if possible, already? Are not Christian fraternities engaged in teaching at the present day, and who lead a blameless, laborious and useful life, often spoken of as if they were the enemies, rather than what they really are, the friends and benefactors of mankind? Nay, what accusations have not been made in this enlightened age against the gentlest, purest, and most refined of women—veritable ministering angels—who devote themselves in a similar manner to the noble work of doing good? Then, if the Christian religion can be maligned in our own time, why cannot we understand that Druidism has been maligned in the past, when its maligners could not be so easily detected as those of the present day?

If it be easy, as we have seen, to find among those recognised as the greatest races the practice of the worst crimes attributed to the Druids, it is, on the contrary, very difficult to find any who proved themselves so superior, intellectually, politically, and morally, to their contemporaries? We have already seen the credit given them by their enemies the

* See Montfaucon, vol. ii., p. 150. † Mun. Ant., p. 231.

Romans, in these respects! Even Cæsar admits that they have instructions in the most sublime of the sciences. Writers of eminence, who have no pretensions to Celtic descent, are of opinion that they must have been acquainted with the telescope, if not with the mariner's compass. Thus, for example, Diodorus Siculus tells us that, in an island west of the Celtæ, the Druids brought the sun and moon near them.* In giving his opinion in favor of this assumption, Dr. Smith very justly remarks that, "Everything within the circle of *Drui, acha*, or magic, or, to speak more properly, within the compass of natural experimental philosophy, was the study of the Druids; and the honor of every wonder that lay within that verge was always allowed them."†

The inhabitants of the Isle of Man give the credit of their ancient laws, which are confessedly among the best that any people can boast of, to the Druids. The *Brehon* laws of Ireland are of a similar character, and are also ascribed to the Druids. "They had a curious mode of trial," says Mr. Higgins, "by the oaths of a certain number of men, who were taught together to swear that they believed the man charged with an offence to be innocent; but it appears that before they took their oaths, all the witnesses whom the prisoner could bring were examined by him, and the judge was bound by their decision. I call this trial, not by adjuration, as it has been inadvertently called, but *trial by jury*; and good trial too. Thus we trace to them both the practice of trial by jury and an unwritten law."‡ We are informed that among the ancient Irish this law was called *Tara*, which is believed to be identical with the *Tora* of the Hebrews. In commenting on this, Col. Vallance—than whom no one has investigated the subject more fully or was better qualified by learning and natural ability to do so—makes the following remarks: "It will appear, by the following laws, that in cases of disputed property the ancient Irish did also try by twelve men, whose sentence must be unanimous. *Coisde* is an original word implying a trial by law; in many parts of Ireland it is still used in that sense, as *Cuirfidhe m'thu*

* Several writers attribute to the Druids the use of gunpowder or some analogous substance. "Among the arcana of nature which our Druids were acquainted with," says Temple, "there are many presumptive, if not positive proofs for placing the art of making gunpowder, or artificial thunder and lightning: though like other mysteries they kept the invention of it a secret."—*Temple's Miscell., on Ancient and Modern History*, lib. vi.

† Smith's *History of the Druids*, p. 75 *et seq.* ‡ The Celtic Druids, p. 286.

ar coisde, I will bring you to trial; Sclavonice, *Kuchja*, the Hall of Justice; Persic *cucheri*, a code of laws."*

We might easily extend the multifarious evidence we have adduced from the most reliable sources in vindication of the Druids; but we think we have given sufficient to convince any intelligent mind that they deserve a very different treatment at the hands of posterity from that which it is the habit to give them at the present day, both in this country and in England. Those who have taken the trouble to accompany us in our researches. have found, if they were not previously aware of the fact, that it is the most learned and most distinguished authors who give most credit to the Druids, and least countenance to the charges made against them. Indeed, the only testimony against them worthy of the slightest consideration, is that of Cæsar; all the others who condemn them admit themselves that they do so mainly, if not exclusively, on his statements. We cheerfully admit that in general he is excellent authority; there is no ancient work in which we have more faith in the main than we have in his Commentaries. Its tone throughout is candid and fair; more so than that of any similar work ever written. A general giving an account of his own conquests has a thousand inducements to misrepresent important facts; in no circumstances can a writer be placed in which stronger temptations are presented to his vanity. But if Cæsar has not been proof against all, certain it is that he has resisted the large majority. He everywhere gives the Gauls credit, not only for great bravery, but, in general, for the noblest qualities which can characterize a race. He frequently speaks of their generosity, their fidelity, their hospitality, and their strong attachment to all bound to them by natural ties; he is far more willing to do them justice in these respects than Livy or Tacitus, although the latter too, especially Livy, yields them the palm of superiority as soldiers.

But Cæsar, above all others, had a powerful motive to render the Druids odious to posterity. By no other means could he expect to justify the cruel treatment they received at his hands, as well as at those of every other Roman general who attempted to subdue the Gauls. It was so universally known that no sect were more learned, or taught a more sublime philosophy, that even those most disposed to misrepresent them did not venture to deny the fact; even

* Collecteana de Rebus Hibernicis, vol. iii., p. 25.

Lucan gave them credit for soaring higher than any of their contemporaries.*

Those who have carefully read Cæsar have not failed to observe that in ascribing good qualities to the Gauls he always gives satisfactory reasons for doing so; he presents us the facts, and enables us to draw our conclusions from them as he has himself. But it is otherwise in the revolting picture which he gives us of the alleged Druidical habit of sacrificing human victims. His only prefatory remark to this is that the Gauls are much given to religion.†

It is generally admitted that the Romans were not a religious people, at least that they were not superstitious; but this did not prevent them from immolating human victims, as we see from the statements of their most patriotic historians. If Livy speaks of an important event, he tells us where it occurred, and states the circumstances that led to it; he does so when he speaks of human sacrifices, as in the instance in which two Gauls and two Greeks were immolated.‡

Tacitus is equally satisfactory in similar circumstances; nor is any one more so than Cæsar in every other instance. Thus, for example, when he speaks of the intelligence of the Gauls, he mentions, among other facts, that he found tablets in the camp of the Helvetii, written in Greek letters (*literis Græcis confectæ*), which contained a particular census of that tribe. But neither he nor any other writer ventures to mention any occasion on which the Druids immolated human beings; much less do they pretend to give names of any person whom they sacrificed. Nothing is more easy than to make charges, especially if they are made by a great con-

---

* In his principal work he speaks of them as follows, while he is bitterly opposed to all priesthoods:

> "To these, and these of all mankind alone,
> The gods are sure revealed, or sure unknown.
> If dying mortal's doom they sing aright,
> No ghosts descend to hell in dreadful night;
> No parting souls to grisly Pluto go,
> Nor seek the dreary, silent shads below,
> But forth they fly *in immortal their kind,*
> *And other bodies in new worlds they find.*"—*Rowe's Lucan.*

† Natio omnis gallorum admodum dedita religionibus.—*De B. G.*, lib. vi.

‡ Lib. xxii, 57.

queror against those whom he has conquered at a time wh
no one dare to contradict him; nor is anything more natu
than that he should make such charges against those w
made longest and most formidable resistance to his pow
But who would accept his statements as conclusive, ev
though he were a Cæsar? There ought at least to be t
credible witnesses to convict a large body of men, adm
ted on all hands to be learned and philosophical, of a capi
offence, and these two, however great their names, should
required to prove how they obtained their knowledge.
court of justice worthy of the name would convict on m
hearsay. But it seems it is quite sufficient to convict t
Druids. This is all wrong. If there be any of our read
who, however, still think otherwise, we earnestly adv
them to investigate the subject, for we feel satisfied that
they do they will alter their minds. But we really do
believe there are. We have not taken these pains to convi
them, but in order to induce them to convince others. Eve
intelligent person exercises an influence on those around hi
and need we say that it should always be exercised in favor
truth and justice? The most uncompromising of their en
mies admit that the Druids did good in their time—that as i
structors of youth, who occupied nearly a quarter of a ce
tury in qualifying themselves for that high office, th
contributed largely to the development of the human min
Those who knew them best appreciated their efforts and r
garded them as benefactors; if they were so to them, they a
to us; for certain it is that all they added to the world
stock of knowledge has not been lost, whether we belie
that they discovered any particular science or not. The
if we are not grateful, let us be just; if we are disposed t
say nothing good of those who taught thousands of yea
ago that knowledge is power, that the soul is immortal, tha
the best of us have faults, and that we ought, therefore, b
indulgent to the faults of our neighbors, we should at leas
cease to war on their ashes.

ART. II.—1. *History of the Thirty Years' War.* Translated from the German of FREDERICK SCHILLER. By the Rev. A. J. W. MORRISON, M. A. London, 1846.

2. *The Life of Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland.* By Lieut. Col. J. MITCHELL, H. P. London, 1840.

3. *The Piccolomini: A Drama in two parts.* Translated from the German of FREDERICK SCHILLER. By S. T. COLERIDGE. (Coleridge's Dramatic Works.)

OCCASIONALLY a dead shrub in a verdant hedge will at intervals surprise the eye: so, in traversing the winding course of history in rare darkling corners, sometimes we encounter a brief period, an event, a man, entitled to a notoriety as yet unattained. A striking specimen of this is the subject of this article—Wallenstein. He played a conspicuous part in an important and exceedingly active age, and the stage was in the very heart of Europe. He was the well-matched opponent of the mighty Gustavus Adolphus; he was the master of his master, and that master was the emperor of all the Austrias, the descendant of the Cæsars; he was the sword-arm of the Catholics through fifteen years of their long struggle with the Reformers, when, in the still uncertain conflict, each party was contending equally for the privilege of its own existence, and for the extirpation of its foemen. Moreover, his greatness was due to the qualities of his own mind and his own character, and not at all to the accident of birth or other fortuitous events, thrusting him involuntarily into a prominent position. He made his own place, almost, even his own surroundings. His career is not surpassed in the brilliancy and romance of its events by the life of any man in history. The simplest narrative of his various and moving fortunes must be melodramatic. Yet he is generally but a dim name of greatness and of wonder; a magnificent shadow, as indistinct as he is grand; an historical ghost, an unreal reality like the wonderful spirit of the Brocken. Coleridge's beautiful translation—for beautiful it is, and grand, despite the carping, linguistic criticisms of the Westminster Review—of Schiller's noble dramas alone makes the name of Wallenstein at all familiar to us; and it is strange how many cultured men have never read even these. Yet they are monuments of a superb genius, and, next to the plays of Shakespeare, there are no historical tragedies in our liter-

ature finer than these worthy renderings of a powerful original. Schiller ranks among the first of dramatists; nor could any one excel as a translator the gifted Coleridge, beneath whose hand the primal beauties take rather an extra glory than that diminution of lustre which usually attends the transformation. Usually we look through this medium as through a glass, darkly, upon the native radiance; but in this case the beams seem to have gathered additional sparkles in their crystalline passage; and the usually just prejudice which enshrouds translations of works depending for their charms on the subtle fascination of poetic genius, must here be laid aside.

The "Thirty Years' War" has not met with equal fortune, though Mr. Morrison has done very fairly by it. The history of a war of thirty years must suffer by compression into the short space of one moderate-sized volume. And when to this we add the formidable barriers presented by the uncouth names, the multitudinous parties, and the tessellated politics of Germany, we find ample reasons for limited circulation. Yet the work is of high merit; it was the fruit of much toil and study; it is very beautifully written, and bears in its workmanship the undisguisable impress of noble powers.

Finally, Mitchell's Life of Wallenstein is not executed with much ability, and is not peculiarly attractive to the general reader. The military hero does not wield the pen with graceful dexterity; probably the sabre is more familiar to his grasp; and his moral episodes and bursts of poetic feeling do not much improve matters. His book is neither very thorough nor very exhaustive, but has many of the faults of a sketch; among others, it quite fails to acquire the tone of authority, which is the natural accompaniment of a sure and sound acquaintance with the subject. The investigations seem to have been conducted with the facility of the dilettante, rather than with the laborious graspings of the trustworthy historian; still the life has the merit of being the narrative of a military career of the seventeenth century, written by an educated military man of the nineteenth century, and we thus obtain some useful suggestions which naturally failed to occur to Schiller, whose youthful military experience probably made him neither a tactician nor a strategist. Moreover, Mr. Mitchell abhors Catholicism and admires Wallenstein; and thus, like a needle between two magnets, he cannot be wholly wrong.

Albrecht Eusebius Wenzeslaus von Waldstein, whose last name the unsettled orthography of the times suffered to become transmuted into Wallenstein, was born in Bohemia, September 15, 1583. His blood was ancient and noble, but in a prolific family; he was the youngest son of a youngest son, and in this unenviable position his prospects of inheritance were meagre. It is an odd fact that both the parents of this great champion of Catholicism were Protestants; but he was left an orphan at the tender and impressible age of twelve, and immediately falling into the hands of the Jesuits, his conversion ensued as a matter of course. Tales are told of a gloomy and aspiring childhood, prophetic of the future conqueror; tales of no note, which we only mention to introduce one of the most successful flights of the moralizing lieutenant-colonel. This gentleman apologizes for treating these narratives with a very reasonable disdain; for, he says: "Rivers formed by numerous springs and rills, none of which can singly indicate the nature and magnitude of the future stream, are, in this respect, justly emblematical, perhaps, of human character. Many that promise fairly at the outset collect whatever is rank and gross in the swamps and poisoned grounds which they traverse, and then infect, as they roll along, whole districts with noxious exhalations; while others, rising from dark and turbid sources, are purified in their progress, flow in fertilizing beauty through the lands, and carry with them only the golden portion of the soil over which they hold their clear and sparkling course" (p. 46). How odd, how strikingly original is this simile! And it is an excellent specimen of the valuable moral reflections, clad in all the flowery charms of a literary warrior's rhetoric, with which this life is most liberally besprinkled for the instruction and entertainment of the reader. "When perfectly unbiassed, women seldom err in their judgment of men; but the cleverest of the sex are so constantly led into error by the influence of wealth, rank, fashion, distinction, and notoriety, as well as by the persuasion of others, that their opinion is rarely of much value. When, however, they are allowed to love men of genius, the probability is, their attachment will prove generous, ardent, and sincere" (p. 56). Thus does the intelligent Mr. Mitchell usher upon the scene Wallenstein's first bride. In fact, the alliance was contracted with a dame respectable equally for her years and her fortune, in both of which she far excelled her young and needy suitor. It is ungracious to

speculate upon which of these traits she hung her power to charm; especially since, soon after the nuptials, having brought her husband to the brink of the grave by a magical love-draught, administered in a fit of wifely jealousy, she herself in good time yielded up the ghost, leaving to her husband her large fortune and her interesting memory. Apropos to the love-draught, Mr. Mitchell tenderly refuses to transplant into his work "a grave and severe lesson" to ladies, which adorns the pages of Wallenstein's Italian biographer; for, says the gallant warrior, "ladies have now obtained a better hold on the affections of men than any which could be acquired by the dangerous and long-forgotten arts here mentioned; their sway over all who deserve to be ruled is sufficiently certain; and the coarse, the rude, and illiterate are alone placed by insensibility beyond the power of female control" (p. 58). What excellent sentiments! What irreproachable phraseology! The colonel's manners to the worthy members of the opposite sex in the drawing-room must present a most interesting study. In the olden times, he tells us that "the free and easy manners of our time, which, when not founded on the highest polish and mental cultivation, or on great goodness and singleness of heart, are generally very bad manners, were quite unknown."

The veil of Wallenstein's mourning for his deceased partner tradition has not ventured to lift; for ten years afterwards we catch no glimpse of him as he lay hidden in the recesses of the deceased fair one's Moravian estate. But in the joys of the inheritance it is only just to suppose that he grieved deeply for her to whom he owed it.

From this obscurity he finally emerged in 1617, to take part with Ferdinand of Grätz in his contest with the Venetians. He raised two hundred horsemen at his own expense, and won whatever glory was won by any one in a not very extensive campaign; and what was of equal or greater importance, he made himself famous for the imposing magnificence of his own mode of life, and for his open-handed munificence to his followers. In those days soldiers were mercenaries; war was a species of land-privateering, and liberality was perhaps the best capital on which a chieftain could rely. As do the vultures to the battle-field, so the freebooting soldiery flocked to such banners; and Wallenstein in after time reaped the full harvest of his prodigal largesses. Wealth, and in her train fame, were now his. "As Fortune is a lady, we are bound to speak of

her in measured terms, though it must be confessed that she sometimes behaves in a manner very discreditable to her sex; Wallenstein's unsupported merit could not obtain a single smile for him, but his wealth instantly called the goddess herself to his arms" (p. 62). The individual thus figuratively called a "goddess" was Wallenstein's second wife, the Countess of Hanach, not thus distinguished for any charms of form or feature, but for the less fragile traits of property and connections; for she was the daughter of Count Hanach, the imperial minister, and had a goodly portion. How fortunate are those who love sincerely in wise places! Wallenstein was certainly stepping steadily up the ladder of success with long strides. Mr. Mitchell pertinently observes that "the waves of ocean bear highest on their breast the bark destined to destruction, at the moment when about to hurl it against the sunken reef which defies alike the skill and courage of the mariner" (p. 63). Probably he thinks that he cannot be accused of bad taste in his figures if he employs only those which constant use through many ages has confirmed as faultless.

The great Thirty Years' War, upon the blood-stained field of which Wallenstein stands forth a commanding and active figure, was one of the many acts in the long drama of the struggle between the Old and the New, the spirit of the Past and the spirit of Change, Catholicism and Protestantism. Europe was sundered by the still unclosed schism of the grand religious dispute. This made the politics and the sympathies of nations; upon either brink the parties mustered in nearly equal numbers, and the unstable scale swayed to and fro, subject to each slight and passing influence. The positions of the great powers were nearly as follows: England had thoroughly committed herself to the Reformation. James II. supported the august character of head of the Anglican Church, with whatever dignity was in his unkingly nature; but he trembled at the sight of a naked sword, and in the continental discussions his people took little or no part. Louis XIII., the youthful monarch of France, though with less of frivolity in his temper than was apt to be the case with French kings, was yet far from wielding his sceptre with a powerful hand. The Huguenots had not been forever suppressed by St. Bartholomew's day, or by the strong and politic rule of Henry of Navarre, (the Fourth); but, hydra-headed, they still showed threatening fangs. So, at the moment of Ferdinand's election to the

imperial throne, France was not available as an active ally of Catholicism beyond her own borders; she soon, however, acquired nearly her proper importance by the rise to supremacy of the astute Richelieu, a prelate of the Church and a statesman whose name remains to the present day as the byword of wily policy. Under his sway the kingdom became like a well-bitted horse in the hands of a skilful jockey. Yet even thus her conduct remained doubtful; if religious sympathy was one rein, still worldly policy was the other; the cardinal abominated heresy, but the minister of France dreaded the power of Austria. Thus, between nicely balanced interests, the action of this kingdom was never sure. Spain was, of course, Catholic to the core; but she was likewise rotten to the core. She was a thin and hollow shell—a name of might, but of small military value. Philip III. was an unworthy descendant of the mighty Charles V. and the stubborn Philip II. Ill-fated Germany, cut, like a checker-board, into many principalities and powers (how incorrect is this name!) was the miserable field on which this great game of draughts was to be played, through all its bloody course to the wretched end of exhaustion. Princes and electors espoused the cause of one or the other religion, and changed the same as convictions or policy commanded. Austria alone was firm for Catholicism. She was, as her power entitled her to be, the head of the alliance of the League, so-called; and against her the Protestant states formed the federation of the Union. Ferdinand the emperor was a man of peculiar temper and incongruous qualities. His most remarkable trait was an obstinacy which seemed at times to possess him like a devil, and which oftentimes did him yeoman's service. He was a strange mixture of dogged resolution and personal inefficiency. With no great qualities of mind, this will, or wilfulness, alone prevented him from falling into mediocrity. History furnishes us no other specimen of a prince who aided an indomitable spirit and boundless courage in asserting it with so little of active or energetic exertion in securing the objects of his stern resolution. Personal vigor in execution was wholly wanting in a character wherein its closely kindred attributes were developed far beyond the ordinary. Nothing could ever bend him from a purpose; nothing could ever urge him to energy in accomplishing it. He uttered his will resolutely, and then he tranquilly awaited the interference of luck or Providence to take in hand the business

of fulfilling it. During most of his reign he was fortunate in having agents who abounded in the qualities in which he was lacking.

Ferdinand's reign opened with the warin the Palatinate, boldly undertaken and feebly sustained by that most impotent of would-be sovereigns, Frederick, called the Palatine, son-in-law of James I. Seldom has a man with the ambition to conceive and the spirit to attempt such bold designs, evinced such imbecility as disgraced the career of this man. Authorities differ as to whether a sermon or a banquet occupied his time while Maximilian of Bavaria was routing his army and shattering forever the fragile fabric of his hopes; neither occupation was very appropriate for so momentous an hour. But perhaps he would have done better had he enjoyed the valuable tutelage of Mr. Mitchell, who ardently exclaims, that "the aspirant for diadems must throw away the scabbard, must keep bright honor alone in view, and set his life as nothing on the cast" (p. 73).

After this the victories of Maximilian and his colleague, Count Tilly, soon quelled all armed revolt. Throughout Germany no hostile standard was to be seen. For a brief moment in his stormy reign Ferdinand sat in his purple robes in Vienna and looked abroad upon an empire at peace. But it was only for a moment. In the condition of Europe at that time, peace was generally but a truce and victory seldom meant conquest. Banditti let themselves out for hire; the hastily-gathered hostile armies manœuvred and fought; the one that was worsted became demoralized, and its hirers bought peace by submission. Soon, having gained an ally or collected funds, they would appear with a fresh army and renew the war. Standing armies could not be maintained, for the imperfect financial system kept the sovereigns in the precarious condition of mercantile speculators, to-day rich, to-morrow penniless; thus, like two well-matched wrestlers rolling upon the grass, now one, now the other uppermost, the prince's power struggled, and the conquered and the conquerer changed places in ceaseless rotation. So now the princes of the Union, after a brief exhaustion, began to rally their resources, called in the aid of Christian IV., of Denmark, an able king, under whose rule his little realm had assumed unwonted importance, and again threatened to embroil Austria.

Thus a storm of war was fast gathering around his borders, while Ferdinand was far from satisfied with the internal state

of affairs. The successes lately won had greatly enfeebled him; his resources were cruelly drained, and he hardly knew whence to gather means to encounter the threatening assault. Moreover, he was as ambitious of independence as of peace, and now he saw with jealousy that he owed all which had been thus far accomplished to Maximilian of Bavaria; and he was further bitterly troubled to see that this potentate was quite aware of his deserts, and inclined to demand an ample reward; he at once claimed to be paid for the past, and propitiated for the future. But Ferdinand well appreciated the merits of a rotation in office, and the more surely events seemed to render Maximilian indispensable to him, the more keenly did he look out for another to supply his place. Wallenstein met him at this point precisely as he wished to be met; he had inherited from his first wife large estates; her successor had brought him no inconsiderable addition; he had done good military service and had taken good wages therefor; he had bought confiscated estates, and because the titles were considered none too good he had gathered them at an immense discount from their real value; his financial operations had been upon the same scale of magnificence and vastness, as was everything else that he undertook. He was now a man of immense wealth—more immense, indeed, than even all these fruitful sources can easily be made to account for. He came forward with a characteristic proposition—one of Olympian grandeur, like all his conceptions, and also, like them, all tending to his own unlimited aggrandizement.

Schiller's spirit seems almost oppressed by the stateliness of the man; he comprehends him not; and in his embarrassment he suspects evil, and utters furtive innuendoes that the great man was at this early hour, in the innermost recesses of his soul, already brooding over treason. The suspicion seems simply absurd. His offer to the emperor was that he would raise an army of fifty thousand men at his own expense; defray all charges of equipment; and keep them in the field at his own expense; that he would hold himself and them implicitly at the command of the emperor, like any other imperial general and army. His only terms were that the force should not be limited to a smaller number; that he should have the nomination of his own officers, and should be allowed to remunerate himself and them from the property which should be confiscated in the principalities which he expected to conquer; also that he should have for himself the pay of 6,000 florins

per month. At the court of Vienna this proposal was regarded as the impossible scheme of a speculator and a visionary; and the courtiers cracked their simple jests and jeered loudly at Wallenstein. But the plan had its merits, and they were not inconsiderable. It cost Ferdinand nothing; if it broke down he met with no positive loss; he simply failed to a prospective gain, and to this he could reconcile himself. He accordingly closed the bargain; and therein he showed a degree of wisdom which should gain him credit at least for mercantile ability. The scoffers soon stayed their ridicule and looked on astounded. The herculean task went on apace. Impossibilities for other men were bagatelle to Wallenstein; and now the world began to appreciate the wonderful powers of the man. The works which he was to achieve were mighty, and already crowned heads began to stare at his deeds. What the horns are to the bull, what hoofs are to the horse, what speed is to the hare, what jaws are to the lion, all this and more was Wallenstein destined to be to Ferdinand. Ferdinand acknowledged his own inability to raise an army in all his kingdom, backed by all of its imperial resources.

In two months Wallenstein was at the head of twenty thousand men; he began his march, and before he reached the confines of Saxony his army numbered thirty thousand fighting men. As the avalanche gathers fresh accretions in its course, so this host grew daily. There was an eclat about the name of its leader which acted like a magical spell upon the men of war. Adventurers from every race of middle Europe flocked to his standard; the very species of troops which he most valued were the men who were allured most surely. Freebooters, men who lived by the sword, loved plunder, feared neither God nor kaiser, would fight against any country with like indifference and ferocity; who scorned a nationality which was but the accidental result of birth or language; who followed their captain for rewards and booty, and who had learned by long experience that the surest way to obtain these objects was to obey well and to fight well. They knew and respected the notorious ability of their chief; they were aware that he was unmatched for liberality, that gold pieces seemed to rain in his camp; that for the purposes of the present war he was as much a soldier of fortune as themselves, and with an infinitely heavier stake to lose, and that the same cast of the die which determined their luck likewise governed his own. Such a host, led by

such a general, was formidable under any circumstances. Co-operating with the forces of Tilly, the Protestants found them invincible.

In the conduct of this campaign we may observe the same wily system of tactics which marks the whole of Wallenstein's military career. His notions were controlled with the utmost art to subserve equally the cause of his master and of himself. Success was in every point of view of the first importance, and this accordingly he always ensured with military skill; further, self-aggrandizement was his ruling motive, and therefore success was always sought by such astute courses as surely promoted this design. Divided glory and divided spoil were alike odious to him. So he disregarded Ferdinand's plan for the campaign, and managed to avoid a junction with Tilly, although imperatively commanded to effect it. But he let Tilly have his full share of the fighting, and then ingeniously contrived himself to garner most of the harvest. Tilly routed the foe, and the name of Wallenstein was terrible; Tilly cleared the country, and Wallenstein pounced upon the booty. Schiller states that his forces gradually swelled to the number of one hundred thousand men—a vast force in those days. Like a deadly canker-worm upon the green leaf, they ranged to and fro through whatsoever territory it pleased them, living on the fat of the land, taking whatever struck their fancy, revelling in the very elysium of marauders. It did not cost Wallenstein much to support them. When they fought—as they did fight some hard battles—they fought well, and they took an ample reward after the victory was won. Christian IV., discouraged and discomfited, retired to his kingdom. Wallenstein sat down before Stralsund to besiege it. He had begun to feel himself invincible; but to besiege a seaport without the aid of a fleet was a useless task; and for the first time he had to desist from his enterprise. Yet the fruits of the seed sown at this siege were to ripen after many years, and were rich enough when they came: For the people of the city in their extremity cried to Gustavus Adolphus for help, and, in answer to their cry, a party of Swedes came to their assistance, and thus gained their first foothold on German soil.

Wallenstein was now peerless in Germany; haughty and unrelenting, he trampled alike on friend and foe, and he fed his insatiate soldiery indiscriminately on the territories of both League and Union. He was hated and feared. But for the

hatred he cared not, and he made the fear a useful servant. When the wronged princes came to him with the remonstrances of anger or of submission on their lips, he scornfully told them it was time now to have done with electors, that Germany must have a single and absolute sovereign like France and Spain. How much happier might have been the lot of Germany had this stern aspiration been fulfilled! Tyranny is a milder mistress than anarchy. So Ferdinand was king from the Adriatic to the Baltic, and Wallenstein was his terrible servant. But the servant was not serving for nothing, and in 1627, having put his army into winter quarters, he hastened to the capital and demanded as his reward the duchy of Mecklenburgh; the hero was as audacious at the footstool of his prince as in the face of the foe. The tongues of many enemies at court wagged violently against him, but he bade them be still and straightway they were silenced. He got his duchy and returned to the head of his hordes. For some time afterwards communications passed between him and the King of Sweden, whose potent alliance he sought studiously to gain by very liberal overtures. Already the prescience of coming events seemed to haunt that astrological spirit; the name of the great King of Sweden rung in his ears like an ominous fateful dirge. He scented trouble in the northern quarter. What there was suspicious in his anxiety to propitiate or disarm by negotiations or alliance this dreaded potentate, we are unable precisely to divine.

But Schiller intimates that the correspondence was traitorous; that Wallenstein was already hatching treason; that he longed even in these hours of triumph and victory to sell himself to the Swedes. The idea is wild and improbable in the extreme. What temptation could Wallenstein hold out to this champion of Protestantism which should induce him to set the imperial general upon a German throne? What cared Gustavus for the internal feuds of Germany? And if religious antipathy to Austria were to move him, why should he choose to exalt the one Catholic who has just shown more dangerous talents than were possessed by any other man of that persuasion then living? Moreover, the emperor knew and approved of the diplomacy. We can see no treason. Schiller had an abhorrence of Wallenstein, and the sentiment is apparent wherever he speaks of him; he fails to do justice to his abilities, and in all his acts he sees nothing but vice. For his

most high-minded deeds this ingenious historian supplies ignoble motives; and the art with which results are made to suggest causes, and the course of history susceptible of many *prima facie* upright explanations, is traced through subtle intricacies to some faithless scheme of this persecuted man, is more indicative of the theorizer than the historian, and does more credit to his subtlety than to his penetration. Schiller was himself deeply imbued with religious prejudice. So far are we to-day removed from the religious struggles of the middle ages that the feelings of the modern historian seldom exceed in force a moderate predilection, and are not apt to betray him into partisanship. But Schiller wrote the history of the Thirty Years' War with the feelings and vigor of a strong partisan. He loves the Reformer and loathes the Papist. Moreover he has a tender heart; the cruel system on which the war was conducted by the mercenary bands of such leaders as Wallenstein, Tilly, and Mansfield, sends a shudder through his generous soul; he sees demons rather than men in these leaders, and he is forever finding for them alien villainies to augment the melancholy list of those which cannot be denied. Common sense forces us to acknowledge that he is at any rate very premature in his efforts to make a traitor of Wallenstein at this period in his career.

Peace at last seemed possible when there were no longer any opponents in the field to dispute the mastery of the emperor; and it was concluded at Lubec, in January, 1819. "This event," says Mr. Mitchell, "left Wallenstein absolute master in Germany and without an equal in greatness; his spirit seemed to hover like a storm-charged cloud over the land, crushing to earth every hope of liberty and successful resistance." This ominous language is painfully fitting. Throughout the war the whole country had been ravaged by his rapacious soldiery, and desolation reigned supreme. Fire, sword, plunder, and brutality had woven their course to and fro over the face of the country, like the tortuous trail of a serpent. Now it remained to pay the leaders, not less greedy than the common soldiery. It is odd to see the various generals soliciting the desired grants and favors, not from Ferdinand, but at the hands of Wallenstein, perfectly trusting that in him lay all the power. But now, standing on the giddy pinnacle of human greatness, and hard pushed by the ascending crowd behind him, he was tottering to his fall. Mr. Mitchell's simile of the ship upon the breakers near the reef should have been saved for this spot. By his

own success he had robbed himself of his own importance. He was no longer needful to his master; and that master loved not overmuch the man to whom he owed overmuch.

Wallenstein might have learned a lesson from the disgrace of Maximilian of Bavaria, on whose ruin he had himself risen. Moreover, the foemen of the domineering chief were countless. The whole court of Vienna hated him; only his precious soldiery swore by him alone, and his officers were fascinated by the general whose star was never obscured; but these had no political influence, nor access to the imperial ear. Dependents he had many, but friends he had none. He was munificent, but cold. Little warmth of devotion was kindled in those mercenary days by a gift; the recipient seized his booty, made off with it like a greedy vulture, and if he hoped for no more from the same quarter there was an end to his gratitude. Wallenstein was the most undemonstrative, unimpressionable, of men. He scattered his donations broadcast like a Roman emperor; but of smiles, of kind words, of sympathetic deeds, he was chary. In the days of trial none stood by him a moment after the cloud seemed to have gotten fairly over the edge of his disk. The influences brought to bear against him were feebly opposed, and at the diet of Ratisbon his deposition was resolved upon. But it might be a hazardous matter to carry this decree into effect? If Wallenstein refused to be deposed, what was to be done. The mighty Austrian emperor had just subdued a vast army of foes, but his might lay in the tent and camp of Wallenstein. What his hair was to Samson that were this mercenary host and its leader to Ferdinand. They were the strength of his empire. What were the chances that the forces would refuse to revolt? Their allegiance was due to Wallenstein; he it was that had mustered and had paid them. They were for sale and he had bought them. They owed nothing, not even daily bread, to Ferdinand. At their head Wallenstein could have marched to Vienna, and chased the emperor on to the bayonets of the Turks. But the species of boldness required in this emergency was just what Ferdinand possessed; he dared to say anything, to order anything. So he hesitated not to bid Wallenstein to retire from the head of this army of his own raising, this army which he might look upon as his private, individual property, and settle himself in rustic comfort on his estates.

These were bold words, but there was no chance that they would be backed by bold acts. Such was not the

nature of the spokesman. Had Wallenstein refused, Ferdinand would have calmly waited till somebody came to help him out of jeopardy. But Wallenstein saved him all this tribulation. He calmly met the commissioners, of whose errand he was well aware, and he submitted at once to the decree. He left the army without a murmur, without an effort at sounding its fidelity. If others dreamed of disobedience, he at least did not. He retired to Gitchin, where he intended henceforth to fix his residence. What now can we think of the spirit of Schiller, who finds ground for mistrust in this very submission! This is cruelty. If an act, in itself perfectly virtuous, nay, magnanimously and strikingly so, is to be referred by subtle interpretation to a vicious motive and deep laid villany, we must require strong and overwhelming proof to justify us in accepting the explanation; the measure we mete is to be measured to us again. Yet not one authority, not one syllable of proof, is adduced by Schiller. Though true it is that this is the principle upon which the whole History of the Thirty Years' War is written, no authorities are quoted; we take the story as Schiller has concluded to tell it; we can believe what he says, only provided that we are willing to put perfect trust in the correctness of his judgment. We must assume that he had the means of arriving at the truth; and that he was capable of using, and did use, these with infallible accuracy. An author who treats his reader in this manner demands a great deal, no matter what may be his reputation; and it is peculiarly improper when history is to be written by a poet and a dramatist, and when a great man is to be accused of black and ignoble crimes. In the nature of the case, too, Schiller's theory is improbable. It is not likely that a hot-blooded warrior, who, astrologer though he was, could read the events and foresee the retributions of the future no more than other mortals, should have calmly allowed the power of present revenge to pass from his hands in anticipation of greater opportunities to come. Yet Schiller would have us believe that Wallenstein anticipated the invasion of Gustavus Adolphus; that he foresaw the successes of that prince; in short, that he read, with a prescience little less than divine, the course of German history for many years to come. How absurd is this! Yet upon an assumption of its truth Schiller would explain the peaceful retirement of Wallenstein, and ask us to believe him at that very moment a traitor. Had Wallenstein really been a man of a genius in anywise ap-

proaching that for which Schiller gives him credit, his success could never have been stayed by human power.

But be the cause what it might, the fact was simply that Wallenstein did, without an effort at disobedience, retire from camp to Gitchin. But in military or domestic life the spirit of the man was the same. He scanned Germany with the eye of a Persian βασιλεύς; a huge magnifying-glass seemed to be ever before his mental vision. Every movement of his mind was stately; every conception was colossal, and his performances were mighty. From magnificent destruction he turned to no less magnificent creation. Having accomplished among cities and hamlets a chaotic ruin, he now set himself to the organization of a busy, prosperous, and plentiful society, within the limits of his extensive domains.

Parks and palaces for his own glory, labor and agriculture for the prosperity of his dependents, were the tasks which he set himself to accomplish, upon his wonted, superb scale. He no longer commanded an army of soldiers; but his workmen seemed a mimic army, and were counted by thousands. The pomp of royalty encompassed him; many of his generals and officers had been pensioned by him with a munificence greater than royalty often exercises; gentlemen of the proudest blood, assembling in his halls, gave to his palace the appearance of a royal court; six noblemen were ever in waiting upon him; sixty accomplished pages, fifty stalwart men-at-arms, formed his retinue; and he never travelled without a hundred carriages, fifty led horses, and sixty state coaches to escort him. He himself, in his cold and haughty demeanor, displayed the inborn power to rule. Proud and uncommunicative, munificent but not genial, he moved amid all this glory without peer, comrade, or friend. Six gates conducted to his palace at Prague; and in his own apartment the silence of absolute solitude, his own dear luxury, was intently preserved. The palace of Sagan which he began, but which he was prevented from finishing, was reputed one of the wonders of the world. Horses were his especial passion, and his stud was always the finest that money and assiduity could obtain. But of pleasure, so-called, he knew not the charm. So seldom did he speak that the harsh tone of his voice seemed to have become rusty from disuse. Banquets and convivialities he loved not; so long as his twelve patrols secured to him unbroken stillness, he seemed to regale himself with the only pleasure of sense which he was capable of enjoying.

On what terms he was with his wisely-chosen wife it is hard to say. We hear almost nothing of her. Probably there was little of either love or hatred between them; probably she had what she asked for, and each followed his and her own course of life, little concerned in the other. Mr. Mitchell remarks that it is odd that in all the duke's correspondence, which ranges from crowned head down to the subaltern who managed his estates, we find not a single letter to his wife. But he seeks relief in the fact that the legacies bequeathed to her in his will and codicils "are in his usual style, splendid and munificent;" and he proceeds to inform us "that there is much more of real character evinced in testaments than might at first be supposed. "How often," he exclaims, "do we see these unhappy documents displaying the pride, fear, hatred, envy, or servility it had been the object, perhaps, of a long life to conceal, and exhibit after death all the poor and ignoble feelings which had lingered to the end in the dark recesses of the breast, and which the grave should in mercy have buried along with the last feeble remnants of mortality." The seeds planted by his youthful lessons from good Dr. Watts seem to have fallen upon good soil in his virtuous bosom, and at last have blossomed and borne fruit an hundred fold in these excellent reflections.

A few brief years rolled on in this manner, but they at last brought with them that event among the results of which was the restoration of Wallenstein to a greater than his former power and glory—that event which Schiller would have us believe his prophetic soul had long since distinctly foreseen. This was the advent upon the confused stage of German politics and religions of the famous Gustavus Adolphus. For a brief period of glory Sweden was now holding a foremost place among the powers of Europe. Under the sway of the enthusiastic and valiant monarch a vigorous life was sent flashing through her veins; and in an age when France and England lay dormant, and when might in the field made the beginning and the end of a nation's greatness, a warlike king and a well-disciplined army gave to Sweden temporary force. Gustavus was the zealous champion of Protestantism; this was doubtless his sincere belief, not a mask or tool for political designs. He was impelled to assert it by force of arms at once; by his own spirit, which was thoroughly that of the warrior, and by the spirit of the age, which loved to seek proselytes beneath the edge of the sword. Moreover, the political

exigencies of the hour pressed him hard. Austria was pushing to the north, and had long contemplated with avidity the idea of establishing a naval force in the Baltic.

This neighborhood would not at all do for Sweden. But the principal motive lay, after all, in the zealous and martial temper of the king, who was the very exponent of the feeling of a conservative age, save that he had in him an unusual dash of liberality. So he responded to the feeble cry for succor which reached his ears from the gasping princes of the crushed Union; and on June 24, 1630, he landed on the northern coast of Germany, at the head of an army which for discipline, equipment, and bravery was then unmatched in the world. It had been the fond toil of his life to form this host, and now its drill and tactics made it seem, among the disorderly hordes of the Continent, almost what the Macedonian phalanx seemed among the unwieldly masses of Persia. Moreover, his camp was like that strange one of Cromwell, wherein was neither swearing, drinking, nor gambling; but a host of fanatics assembled at the matin and the vesper hours to hear prayers and exhortations from the *lips* of fanatic preachers. At first his advent was disregarded by the haughty court at Vienna, rendered presumptuous by a long series of successes. But these were gone with their cause; and by degrees this little cloud in the horizon, no bigger than a man's hand, spread over the face of the heavens, the black pall of the tempest. Count Tilly commanded the imperial forces. He was an able commander, of tried bravery, of long experience in strategy and high renown in tactics; a stern, relentless, unyielding soldier of the hardest school. Ferdinand trusted in him implicitly, but he trusted in vain. At Leipzig the Imperial and Swedish armies first encountered. It was after the Swedes had been long in the country, for neither general had been very desirous to meet the other, and there had been a great deal of marching and manœuvring. This mutual timidity was justified by the trial; hither and thither the changeful tide of battle rolled; now the Swedes were routed and in flight; now they rallied, and the Imperialists in turn were broken. The contest was savage, stubborn, long, and doubtful. At length it inclined in favor of the indomitable Swedes. Once decided, the completeness of the victory was proportioned to the bloody and disastrous nature of the fight; and the Austrian army was so scattered and destroyed that scarcely two thousand men could be gathered together from the wreck on the following day.

In a second conflict, some months later, Tilly himself was mortally wounded. Matters thus rapidly came to a perilous crisis for the emperor. East and west, north and south, the Swedes ranged uncontrolled, unopposed, through Germany; their compact host met with no barrier able to stay its resistless course. Already it was rumored abroad that Gustavus aimed to empty the imperial throne of an occupant who seemed unable to keep his seat thereon, and to fill it himself. The Austrian supremacy had apparently lived out its allotted term; and its brilliant flame was dying feebly away in thin smoke. David had smitten Goliah, and the giant had reeled. Unless some Deus ex Machina would opportunely furnish his miraculous aid, Ferdinand seemed undone forever. And what God was there, save one? To Wallenstein even his foes now, perforce, turn for aid. Schiller says that he was engaged in subtle machinations to effect this result. When the hostile forces were marching upon Prague, and Wallenstein was at the time living in the city, the terrified authorities would fain have looked to him for guidance and command; but he gave them cold comfort, absolutely refused to grant any active assistance, and soon after, as the danger grew more imminent, he left the city, which was then of necessity surrendered. Schiller is indignant beyond measure at this conduct. He vehemently charges Wallenstein with betraying the general cause for the ignoble purpose of rendering his own services more imperatively necessary.

It may be that his statement is correct, that Wallenstein might have held the city had he chosen to make the effort; or it may be that the city was really untenable, and that Wallenstein was unwilling for many natural reasons to undertake a fruitless defence. This question we cannot now determine. If the former supposition be true, certainly Wallenstein displayed no great magnanimity; but equally certainly it was neither villany nor treachery in him, a private and disgraced citizen, to refuse to accept a command for which he had no commission. The worst that can be justly said is that his behavior was guarded and selfish; and that he was a consistently selfish man is undeniable. But he could now dispense with wire-pulling; art was not requisite to secure the inevitable offer, or more properly, the inevitable request, which Ferdinand now preferred, that he would assume the command-in-chief. He was indispensable. His foes at court fired one Parthian arrow, however, and it was

it proposed to unite with him in equal authority the
of Hungary. The fiery duke, in a storm of wrath,
that he would accept no divided command were God
lf to be his coadjutor. Ferdinand was in no condition
rley; he retracted the offensive proposition, and suf-
the duke to make his own terms. And the duke
them, hard and haughty enough; for which he has
er's heartfelt malediction.

ut why should he not have done so? He was
under no bonds of gratitude to Ferdinand; of
wo he had certainly not been behindhand in
ts. Now he simply drove a bargain; what he had
rter was worth a high price, and, like the books
Sibyl, it rose in value with the delay to purchase.
ver, he had learned by no vicarious experience what
he reward of a too successful general after his work was

If his conduct was not poetically high-spirited, it was
nly sternly just. His first effort extended only to raising
my, which he agreed to do, and did, in three months.
the humbled and suppliant emperor had again to be-
him to assume the command of it. He finally consented
pon condition that so long as he remained general-
he should be entirely absolute, independent of the
or's orders, and free to dispose at his will of all the
rty which should be conquered and confiscated.

s conduct during the ensuing campaigns was an artful
nation of good generalship and adroit selfishness. He
l Gustavus with alarming skill, and punished his
al foe, Maximilian of Bavaria, with wily malice. Gus-
shut himself up in Nuremberg; Wallenstein sat down
e to starve him out. Neither scoffs of foes nor entreat-
friends could move him. In vain Gustavus sought to
on a battle; in vain the imperial troops grumbled at
n. The inflexible one only said that "blood enough
en shed." And in the end the grim hero did starve
e Swedish king; though in the process he had so
starved himself that when the Swedish forces left the
ey were allowed to drag out their weary retreat unmo-

But with two such generals and two such armies in
ld the war was not destined to be finally settled by
strategy, without a decisive trial of strength. A
attle was inevitable, and it was finally fought near
—an ever memorable name! The hosts met each
with that stern resolution which always characterizes

a contest between veteran troops who neither undervalue their adversary nor distrust their own commander. It was a hand-to-hand contest, ferocious beyond the wont of even those ferocious days. Generals and men were well matched. Gustavus seized a favorable moment to attack when Wallenstein was weakened by the departure of a heavy detachment under his general Pappenheim.

At first the Swedes carried all before them, the imperialists broke and fled. Then was seen the personal power of Wallenstein —"Night must it be ere Friedland's star can beam!" Amid the flying ranks his voice, his presence, as if by magic, restored discipline, reformed the ranks,and rolled back again the surging tide of victorious Swedes over all the ground which they had gained. Again the balance quivered, doubtful. In this crisis of the conflict, Gustavus fell mortally wounded. Ordinarily such an event would have decided the victory at once; but, strange to say, the Swedes, instead of being discomfited, were only incited by a demoniacal rage to revenge the fall of their adored leader. Wallenstein's outnumbered troops were again giving ground; the imperial ammunition train caught fire, and with horrible uproar wagon after wagon exploded, and added to the panic. But a second time the fortune of the day was restored by the unexpected appearance and opportune onslaught of Pappenheim at the head of his cavalry. This leader had been overtaken on his route by news of the movement of Gustavus, and, appreciating the hazard caused by his absence, had made all haste to return. His advent checked the triumph of the Swedes; but his men and horses, wearied by a long and rapid march, were unable to do more; and the battle ceased by reason of the utter exhaustion of both combatants. Each retired from the field, but Wallenstein retired the further and did not return; the Swedes, on the contrary, a day or two after, marched on to the ground and brought away their own and the imperial artillery. This fact certainly entitled them to claim a victory,and it seems further probable that the army of Wallenstein was much the more shattered of the two. But the death of Gustavus far outweighed this slight advantage. This monarch has ever deservedly been a universal favorite. Tolerant in an age of intolerance; merciful in an age of ferocity; generous in an age of selfishness, his virtues borrow extra brilliancy from contrast with the evil natures and dark passions with which they were surrounded. Weak men or

vicked men made up the sum of the leaders in war and in olitics in those days. Even if we wash away the doubtful tain of treason from the fame of Wallenstein, he yet remains man of no *virtue*: selfish and able, but neither magnanimous or philanthropic; a fearful tyrant, but never a benefactor of ankind. Schiller loves Gustavus Adolphus as a poet loves is hero, and speaks of him with the most laudatory, fond, lmost caressing epithets; and it is with a feeling of sorrow, lmost like the grief felt for a personal friend, that he records is death. The paragraph in which he depicts the deep mourn-ig that fell upon the whole Swedish court, is touching in the xtreme, and might well, as Carlyle says, "draw 'iron tears' rom the eyes of veterans."

From this moment the mist which shrouds the plans of Vallenstein becomes inpenetrable; his actions become du-ious, his aims inscrutable—from this moment he *may* have egun to deserve the name of traitor. Since his first assump-ion of the command, he had held it of the first importance to letach Saxony from the Swedish alliance. The Electorate f Saxony was very powerful, and her adherence was the back-one of the cause of Gustavus in Germany. If Gustavus and Wallenstein were equally matched, then the Elector John George was the deciding weight. Accordingly, Wallenstein esorted to every art to shake his steadfastness; the most empting lures in the power of Ferdinand to offer were held ut to him. He wavered, but would not be fairly enticed. 'hen violence was tried; his provinces were made the seat of 'ar and the theatre of fearful ravages; and still he was given understand that his defection was desired and would stay l this desolation. This course promised to be more effective. t the death of Gustavus, Wallenstein was still exerting all e manœuvres of his art to bring about this result.

Schiller will have it that he sought for himself independent principality in Saxony, which would ace in his vigorous grasp that useful balance which ow trembled so indecisively in the feeble hand of ohn George. But the emperor was cognisant of the egotiations; and what are the grounds of Schiller's spicions it is not easy to see, especially since, as usual, he igns to furnish no authorities. But after the battle of utzen, Wallenstein's course is not clearly to be explained. either fidelity nor treason will give us an unbroken clue to e labyrinth of his policy. Perhaps he meditated treachery id was unable to resolve fully to commit himself thereto.

He seems to us like a man pursuing an evil path with a faltering tread, and anon turning to retrace his steps while yet there was time. He relaxed his military exertions, and opened communications with the Swedes. He professed to seek peace. Schiller says he sought the imperial throne; but this seems to us going too far. The mighty Austrian truncheon would have well become that potent grasp; but the very abilities which fitted him for the place also taught him the folly of aiming at it. He was a man of magnificent schemes, but likewise he was a man of sound wisdom. If his ends had always been lofty, still his means had ever been vast. If his conceptions of his objects were colossal, no less so were his conceptions of his tools. Thus far he had never miscalculated the adequacy of the one or the other, had never allowed himself to become the dupe of an untimely ambition.

It was strange if this practical wisdom, which so long had marked his course, which had carried him safe through undeserved disgrace following close upon self-won triumphs in the hotter blood of younger days, was now at last in his mature years to fail him, and yield before a giddy scheme which none but a madman or an imbecile could cherish. To overturn the throne of Austria! to depose the descendant of the Cæsars! His proud soul would have quivered with exultation at the idea. But he who had undertaken much and never failed, who had the benefit of no small experience in measuring the sufficiency of his resources, ought not to have been entrapped by the glamour of magnificence alone. And what implements had he wherewith to accomplish the mighty upheaval and no less mighty reconstruction? Could he expect that the Swedes would assist to seat him upon the imperial throne? They were not the material out of which a Prætorian cohort could be made, and none knew this better than Wallenstein. Then, moreover, they and the Saxons alike mistrusted him, and suspected his negotiations. They thought he aimed only to outwit them, and bring their throats fairly within his grasp, and then to strangle them forever. Whatever his friends may have suspected, his foes were unable to believe him a traitor. Mr. Mitchell will see no treason; but this is not very encouraging, for Mr. Mitchell does not betray such talent or acuteness in his work as to render his opinion valuable.

On the other hand, Schiller believes in his guilt to the uttermost extent; but neither is this very discouraging; for even in holding the pen of the historian, Schiller cannot d-

nself of the feelings of the poet. His conception of
stein is thoroughly dramatic even in his history. In
mas the character is, in an artistic view, unapproach-
ve by Shakespeare; and exactly in this range of char-
ven Shakespeare has nothing finer. This picture of the
saviour of a mighty realm, hesitating and trembling
thought of becoming the betrayer of his own noble
nd while dallying with the awful idea, suddenly trans-
into a fugitive, and falling beneath the daggers of
s, presented a fascination which the spirit of Schiller
ıot withstand; to conceive it was to believe it. And
n Schiller, in a moment of honesty, confessed that he
t sure of the correctness of his judgment of Wallen-
What, then, is to be thought of Schiller's conduct?
dramatists, and novelists, who take for their subjects
ents and persons of real life are under the most awful
ions to conduct their work with conscientious scrupu-
How nobly have Shakespeare and Sir Walter Scott
d their responsibility! What departed spirit can in
rld to come call them to account for wilful defamation
racter? None; and this fact is not the smallest of
lories. An historical personage is embalmed in a
oem, a great drama, a great novel; and as he appears
so will his portrait forever look out upon the world.
istory can seldom correct this coloring or this outline.
cruel deed for a gifted writer to use his genius to the
destruction of a fair fame; nor is this often done out
tonness or malice, but far too often out of careless dis-
. We doubt if Schiller reflected sufficiently upon this
hen he wrote "The Piccolomini." Had he, in fact,
ubt which he confessed as to the truthfulness of his
tion, he ought never to have embodied it in those su-
cenes; or at least, since we should be loath to forego
he ought to have published prominently in connection
hem the doubt which lurked in his mind; for from
amnation the spirit of Wallenstein can have no resur-
.

e whispers of treason which floated in the air, and
hickly in Vienna, exceedingly disturbed the mind of
nperor. His only anxiety soon became to lay the
which he had evoked. He had tried once and success-
he experiment of removal, but he hardly ventured now
it again; so he resorted to a subterfuge. Count Galas
commission to supersede Wallenstein as generalissimo,

and the divers generals upon whom Ferdinand thought l could depend were scattered through the various camps t take all possible precautionary measures for some days be fore the removal was proclaimed, which was intended to hav all the force of a surprise. One fact is noteworthy: from nc source can we learn that Wallenstein made any effort tc counteract the machinations which he must have known were at work against him; calmly and scornfully he watched the meshes of the web which was weaving around him. He seemed to be jealous neither of his safety nor of his good name. This looks more like the innocence of a haughty spirit than the wiliness of a villanous one.

At last the storm burst. Galas proclaimed his commission. Wallenstein saw himself universally regarded as a traitor, and friends and dependents fell away from him; he became shunned like a leper. Shortly before, a few zealous friends had summoned all the generals to a banquet, where, as the story goes, they showed them a paper binding them all tc the service of Wallenstein, saving their allegiance to the emperor; after the wine had gone freely about, what pur ported to be the same document was passed about for signa tures; but in this second paper the clause "saving their al legiance to the emperor" was omitted. This seems like an idle tale, and if it is true it ought certainly to have warned Wallenstein that his officers were not to be much depended upon, since it was thought necessary by his friends to resor to such a foolish ruse in the business. At any rate, Wallen stein found himself now left naked to his enemies; the em peror drove him into the arms of the Swedes, and in hi present straits they could hardly refuse to credit his sincerity He fled to Egra, and arrangements were made for them t meet him there; he hoped to be able to deliver the place into their hands. On the night preceding the day ap pointed for their coming, after a late sitting with his favorite astrologer, Seni, he retired to sleep. But those who murde sleep were at work; while he had been reading the stars knives had been whetting for his bosom. Almost before h had fallen into slumber, an uproar arose in his ante-chamber Rising to upbraid the tumult, the silence-loving general me upon his threshold the ferocious gang of assassins, and in moment, beneath the savage blows of many daggers, th great warrior fell and breathed his last, passing to a deepe stillness than all his efforts had been able to compass upo earth.

II.—*State Bank System of the United States*, 1865.

ITH the exception of the issues of the Bank of the d States, which was first chartered in 1791 for twenty , and re-chartered in 1816 for another period of twenty , the paper currency of the country, previous to the ıencement of the rebellion, consisted of the issues ınk corporations, chartered by the several states and ories of the Union. Over these state banks the Fede- lovernment neither claimed nor exercised any control soever. Some notion of the number and variety of the authorities by which these institutions were created, be had from the Bank Statement of the Treasury rtment for January 1, 1860, showing that at that date were:

	Banks and Branches.	Circulation.
the 6 New England States,	505	$44,510,618
" 5 Middle States,	485	53,146,871
" 5 Southern States,	146	35,863,618
" 6 S. Western States,	138	46,000,759
" 9 Western States,	288	27,580,611
l, 31 states and territories,	1,562	$207,102,477

nder our system it is to be understood that no state or orial bank was under the control or supervision of the ral Government, or any other common or central author- and the conduct of the individual banks showed in al times that they were practically uncontrolled by the authorities which created them. Very few of those ed in the interior kept their currency at par in the sea- l cities. Most of them were always uncurrent in the ipal marts of domestic and foreign commerce; indeed, rincipal cities of the Atlantic coast have seldom, and for brief periods, kept their banknotes at par in New

or very many years, weekly lists of the rates of dis- t upon these state banks have been published at Boston, York, and Philadelphia, showing nineteen out of twenty ng from one quarter to two and a half per cent. below ar of the bank paper of the respective cities when they in the best credit, and falling to ten and fifteen per discount in times of monetary disturbance. In Hodge's Note Reporter of June 1, 1864, New York state paper oted at ½ discount in Boston; Pennsylvania state at ⅝

in Philadelphia, and ¾ to 1 in Boston; New York state at ⅞ in New York city; Pennsylvania at ¾; Baltimore ¾; Ohio 1; Indiana 1; Missouri 2 to 50.

The failures of these corporations in the last fifty or sixty years have been numerous and heavy. Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, reported one hundred and sixty-five which occurred between January 1, 1811, and January 1, 1830, having an aggregate capital of thirty millions of dollars; of these as many as forty-three broke in the single state of Kentucky, twenty in Ohio, nineteen in Pennsylvania, ten in Virginia, and nine in Maryland. In the vaults of these broken banks the government had $1,390,707; and he adds that "the loss to individuals amounts to many millions." In a report made to the Federal Congress in 1843, the bank failures of the United States during the year 1841 are given as fifty-five in number, with an aggregate capital of sixty-seven millions, and a circulation of twenty-three and a half millions.

In Hodge's Bank Note Reporter for June 1, 1864, a list of "failed" and "worthless" banks is given. The number in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut is seventy-eight; New York city, twenty-six; New York state, sixty; New Jersey, thirty-eight; Pennsylvania, sixty-five; Delaware, three; Maryland, twenty-five; District of Columbia, thirty-nine; Ohio, forty-seven; Indiana, forty-three; Illinois, nine; Michigan, twenty-nine—in fifteen of the loyal states and the District of Columbia, four hundred and sixty-two banks which had gone into insolvency. The losses sustained by the note holders and depositors of these banks are quite incalculable.

But the system is not only chargeable with the perpetual wear and tear of discount upon every note, whether passed at home for commodities purchased in the Atlantic cities, or remitted for purchases and payments, and the fearfully frequent and extensive bankruptcies which have marked its history. It must be held to answer, also, for its agency in the great commercial revulsions which have happened, with the certainty and almost the regularity of a natural law, in the half century of its uncontrolled rule.

Previous to the year 1834 no efforts were made by the Federal Government to collect and arrange the returns of the state banks, and when, by a resolution of Congress in June, 1832, the Secretary of the Treasury was "directed to lay

before the House, at the next and each successive session of Congress, copies of such statements or returns, showing the capital, circulation, discounts, specie, deposits, and condition of the different state banks and banking companies, as may have been communicated to the legislatures, governors, or other officers of the several states within the year, and made public; and when such statements cannot be obtained, such other authentic information as will best supply the deficiency," the officer to whom the duty was entrusted found these returns and sources of information exceedingly imperfect, both incomplete and inexact; of which the evidence furnished by the annual reports made since 1834 is unfortunately only too conclusive. The returns of the banks in different states are made in different months from January to December, affording no certainty as to the amount of circulation on any one day of any one year, and more especially rendering their reports of specie wholly unreliable; the weakest and worst of them being at liberty to put a parade dress upon their condition to answer the exigencies of their affairs. Apart from all honest uncertainties incident to this manner of reporting, it is well known that returns of the same specie funds were in many instances duplicated, counted once by the weaker bank having a specie credit in the stronger, and by the latter as coin actually in its vaults, with all the other manipulations of accounts and statements to which irresponsible corporations are known to resort. The only confidence that these returns deserve is, that they never overstate their liabilities or understate their resources, and that when they give their circulation on a stated day, or an average for any period, they are sure to put the figure at its minimum estimate. Moreover, the Secretary of the Treasury, in 1855, says of the data afforded: "In some years their returns have been very imperfect, the confusion that reigned among them being such that they apparently hardly knew how to make returns."

For the period previous to 1834 we have no documentary publications, nothing but estimates of experts, which, however, may well be as worthy of reliance as the nature of the inquiry they were engaged in permits. Those given for the earlier years of our banking history are estimates by Samuel Blodgett, who published his "Economica" in 1806; for the years between 1806 and 1830 we have the authority of Mr. Gallatin, Mr. Woodbury, and Mr. Crawford, Secretaries of the Treasury. The annual reports of the Treasury began in 1835.

A brief history of the bank circulation since 1790 will answer the purpose for which it is here presented: In 1790 there were but four banks in the Union, having an aggregate capital of $1,950,000; in 1804 there were fifty-nine banks in operation, with an aggregate capital of $39,500,000.

It is believed that but a small part of the capital of the state banks was paid up. The United States Bank was established in 1791, with a capital of $10,000,000, and its paid-up capital probably exceeded that of all the state banks together. It is known, also, that so lately as the year 1800 coin constituted the bulk of the currency, banknotes being rarely seen south of the Potomac or north of the Alleghanies.

In the year 1808 the estimated specie in the country exceeded the amount of banknotes in circulation. The return made to the Treasury by the United States Bank in that year gave its specie at $15,300,000, its circulating notes at $4,787,000; and another return made in 1810 did not materially vary in these respects. But the policy of the New England banks for some time previous to 1808 was widely different. They commenced the expansion of their issues probably in 1803, and pushed it to the extreme limit of their credit, so that in 1808 and 1809 a grand explosion occurred, by which most of them were damaged and some of them totally destroyed.

The abundance of specie existing before the year 1808 is accounted for by the long continuance of the wars in Europe between the maritime nations, which threw the carrying trade of the South American mines into our hands. In that year Napoleon invaded Spain; England became her ally and protector, and the long interrupted direct trade between England and the Spanish colonies in America was resumed. At the same time our embargo law, followed by the act of non-intercourse, and finally by war with England, from June 1812 till December 1814, prevented the export of United States produce to foreign countries, and drained away the precious metals after the accidental supply had been cut off. The resulting scarcity of coin, and the increased demand for currency required by the exigencies of the war, was, as is well known, supplied by an excessive issue of banknotes, which was followed by a suspension of specie payments by all the banks south of New England in September, 1814. The check of redemption removed, the expansion went on, and seems only to have been accelerated by the proclamation of peace in February, 1815. The bank issues, estimated at thirty

ns in 1811, before the war, and at forty-seven millions
the time of the general suspension of specie payments,
it by Mr. Gallatin at seventy millions in 1816, and by
rawford, with probably a closer approximation to the
at ninety-nine millions.

n inflation so prodigious occurring in time of peace, and
nsequently diminished rapidity of business circulation,
ecessarily followed by a correspondingly heavy collapse.
ulation of not above nine millions, with a paper cur-
of eleven dollars *per capita* in their hands, or fully
e the amount required by the condition of industry and
the whole mass resting upon a specie basis of about
y millions, or one dollar for the redemption of five,
not escape a revulsion alike extensive and disastrous.
onsequence was the most appalling distress which the
ry had ever seen, and which even to this day is with-
parallel. The root of the evil was in the attempt of
vernment to carry on an expensive war by loans of
credits and banknotes, thereby making irredeemable
a national currency, assisting in its circulation, and
raging its expansion. A national currency, such as our
nbacks," or the notes of the national banks, based upon
l States bonds, rests upon the faith and resources of the
; and, however much it may be temporarily depreci-
is yet redeemable. But a corporation currency, rest-
ly upon the debts of bankrupt borrowers, is utterly
ss, and its total excess is simply worthless.

ne fluctuations in the amount of paper currency which
and resulted from the great revulsion of this period,
ling to the estimates of Mr. Crawford, Secretary of the
ury, in 1820, stood thus:

note circulation in		1811.....	$29,000,000
"	"	1813..62,000,000 to	70,000,000
"	"	1815..99,000,000 to	110,000,000
"	"	1819..45,000,000 to	53,000,000

g the lowest figures in these estimates, they would
a *per capita* circulation in 1811, before the war, of
; in 1813, before the suspension of specie payments,
; in 1815, at the close of the war, $10.58; in 1819,
liately after the general bank crash, $4.81. But it is
nown that during the year 1816 the banks continued
ne abundantly, and that floods of unchartered currency
s were poured out in notes of all denominations, from
nts up to five and ten dollars. The banknote re-

porters of the time give lists of notes in circulation by chartered and unchartered companies and individuals about equally numerous. After the 20th of February, 1817, Congress prohibited the receipt of inconvertible paper in payment of public dues. About the middle of 1818 the contraction began, and at the end of 1819, the banks had settled into what "Nile's Register" calls "a state of regularity;" meaning that the survivors had reduced their circulation to such an extent that, for the purpose of remittance, their notes or drafts on the metropolitan banks were worth a fraction more than silver coin, which was itself very scarce, owing to the preparation then making by the Bank of England, and the imports of specie by Austria and Prussia, for the replacement of their paper currencies with specie. At this time lands in the interior and agricultural products were for sale at one-third the price they commanded when the unusual indebtedness of the people was made, and at half the prices readily obtained in 1808-10.

In the period 1820 to 1830 the increase of banks and of paper money was not in the aggregate considerable, but the conduct of many of these ungovernable institutions was such that in the decade several ruinous fluctuations occurred in different districts of the country. We have no statement of the condition of the banks and the amount of currency afloat during this term, but we know that the years 1826–7–8 were marked by convulsions of the banks of New York, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Rhode Island, with heavy failures among the manufacturers of New England, and widespread distress, insolvency, and litigation all over the country. All of which means not, perhaps, excessive issues of bank currency, but a general and disastrous disturbance of monetary affairs, which neither the state banks nor the United States Bank, then in full operation with its capital of thirty-five millions and its credit worth still more, was able to remedy.

Mr. Gallatin puts the circulation of 1830 at sixty-one millions, a *per capita* average of $4.74, something too small, perhaps, for the demands of business; but the paper money of this date was helped by a considerable excess of imports over the exports of specie in the two preceding years, amounting to above eight and a half millions of dollars; the great increase of the home supply of manufactures, protected by the high tariff of 1828, and the reduction of the exports of specie to China and the East Indies by the use of bills drawn

by the United States Bank on England for the accommodation of our merchants, which temporarily deferred the export of specie.

But in the ensuing six years the banks went wild again. Catching the earliest hopes of reviving prosperity, they extended their issues from sixty-one millions in 1830 to one hundred and forty-nine millions in 1837. Their specie, in the meantime, increased but sixteen millions (from twenty-two to thirty-eight millions). The average circulation for this year of enormous expansion affords $9.52 *per capita*, while that of great Britain and Ireland in the same year stood at $6.47. It stood at thirty-two cents per head above that of England and Wales, with their two-fold annual products of industry at that date, and correspondingly larger requirements of currency. The consequence was a suspension of payments by all the banks, including the mammoth United States Bank, in May, 1837, as if by common consent. During the residue of the year specie bore a premium at Philadelphia of various rates up to twelve per cent., and the bank paper of the different states was at various and fluctuating rates of discount, in some instances as high as twenty per cent., not in specie, but in the paper of the Philadelphia banks.

Favored by an excess of imports of specie over exports in the two years ending September 30, 1838, amounting to nearly twenty millions, the banks of New York and New England resumed specie payments in May, 1838. The banks of Philadelphia made three resumptions and as many suspensions before February, 1841; and did not effectively resume until March, 1842. The notes of the banks to the south and west of New York were at various rates of discount—one, five, ten, fifteen, and even to eighty per cent.; and specie at various rates of premium up to fourteen per cent., as measured in Philadelphia paper, which was at the time inconvertible. The reaction of this monetary crash is shown, as in that of 1819, by the fact that the circulation, which amounted to one hundred and forty-nine millions in 1837, was reduced in 1843 to fifty-eight millions—an average *per capita* of the population of $3.06, as against $9.52 in 1837. This is fluctuation with a vengeance.

The next general explosion of our paper money system occurred nine years after the California gold mines were fairly opened. From July 1, 1848, to July 1, 1857, California had furnished to the Mint and branches $383,873,100; and the mines of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina,

Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and New Mexico had yielded $4,514,469, in gold. The silver of domestic production deposited at the Mint and branches amounted to $2,630,055, making together a grand total of $391,017,624. The total silver coinage amounted to $33,621,148. What part of this sum was an actual addition to the silver in circulation we do not now stop to determine. According to the Custom House returns, the exports of coin and bullion in these nine years exceeded the imports $271,400,133. Here we have some basis for an estimate of the increase of specie in the country in this period. The Secretary of the Treasury, in December, 1857, estimated it at one hundred and forty millions. He believed the amount in 1849 to be one hundred and twenty-nine millions, and in 1857 two hundred and sixty millions. The data given would afford this sum, if to the gold from our mines we add twenty millions of the total silver coinage as a probable addition to the circulation, and assume that the residue was but the recoinage of foreign silver money previously making a part of our currency. This calculation, however, assumes that our stock of coins increases or decreases annually, as the amount imported and received from our own mines exceeds or falls short of the amount exported; and it further assumes that the gold and silver brought in by immigrants and others and not reported, and that entering overland from Mexico, would balance the amounts clandestinely exported, as well as the amount consumed in manufactures and the annual loss by abrasion.

But if the increase had been double the estimated amount, the banks would very certainly have extended their issues and credits in proportion. Their reserve of specie had increased but seventeen millions, and they had added one hundred millions to the one hundred and fourteen and three-quarter millions of their circulating paper out in 1849, and expanded their loans and discounts from three hundred and thirty-two and a third millions to six hundred and eighty-four and a half millions. In September and October they suspended specie payments, and in about three months contracted their circulation from two hundred and fifteen to one hundred and fifty-five millions, and reduced their loans to five hundred and eighty-three millions; a reduction of the former of twenty-eight and a half per cent., which was followed by a general fall of prices during the twelve months ensuing, averaging twenty-five per cent. The solvent banks resumed specie payments early in 1858, after creating such stringency in the

y market as so great a reduction of currency and bank
ts must necessarily occasion. Among the facts which
ed the revulsion and showed its extent was the dimin-
l consumption of foreign merchandise. In the twelve
hs ending three months before the suspension, the
gn imports entered for consumption amounted to three
lred and thirty-seven millions; in the twelve months
ediately succeeding, they fell off to one hundred and
y-three millions—the average consumption *per capita*
g from $11.81 in the former year to $6.57 in the latter,
luction of over forty-four per cent.

Enough has been said to exhibit fully the fluctuations of
ank issues in amount, the cost of exchange between the
ipal business marts of the country, the frequent con-
ons in mercantile affairs, and the mischief wrought by the
l inflations and reductions of market prices, marking the
e history of our state banking system. It must not,
ver, be inferred from the exclusion of other agencies in
brief historical notice, that the banks are to be regarded
e sole or primal causes of our business catastrophes. It
ld be easy to show that, in the groups of years covered
ur monetary convulsions, the varying amounts of foreign
rts for domestic consumption have borne a determinate
to the bank circulation, increasing and decreasing to-
er. Not in exact proportion, indeed, for in some years
bank circulation increased more than the imports, and
me, particularly at the times of the severest collapses,
ank circulation fell lower than the imports. But this
nce is explained by the exigencies of the case, and an
lute dependence and reciprocity is well proved. For
in reasons, it is probable that the excessive imports
always at the bottom of the mischief, but the bank in-
ns invariably answered like an echo and gave the mis-
its effect by enlarging the credit system and stimulating
ulative expansion of the banks till they bursted. It is
his fellowship in mischief with all speculative overtrad-
hat they are here arraigned; and for this offence the
r of facts has been given; for partners in crime are not
ess culpable for being what lawyers call accessories after
act, or merely secondary in point of time, but active in
onspiracy and equally effective in participation.

t will be observed that we have only attempted to ex-
somewhat in relief the critical changes which have marked
liseased movements of the system. These have occurred

with the periodical constancy and regularity of chill and fever, with the intermissions filled with nervous tremors, as mischievous as the paroxysms themselves. The "panics" and "squalls of the money market" have been incessant, and only a little less remarkable than the revulsions; just as "sickly seasons" are less alarming than the sudden visitation of the Asiatic cholera, though their victims even outnumber those of the more violent scourge.

Statisticians are accustomed to measure the relative supply of currency at different periods by its average proportion to the total population; but population is the most uncertain of all measurements of demand for money. The amount of commercial exchanges would be a better basis, for it would at least be occupied with the subject matter of payments. But the amount of exchanges cannot be inferred with any tolerable certainty from the value of the products or commodities supplied to the market in any given period. The exchanges are sometimes very rapid and sometimes very slow. And further, if the amount of values in exchange could be ascertained, the amount of money required for payments is not thereby determinable. In the proportion that business is better organized less money is required, payments being then effected more largely by set-off; of which the clearings of bank debts among themselves, showing something under five per cent. to be the usual balances, is an example. The same or similar processes are conducted by individual banks and bankers for their respective customers, dispensing with money in any form to the extent that mutual debts and credits are balanced for them.

The aggregate value of the imports and exports of Great Britain and Ireland in the year 1840, was one hundred and thirty-eight millions of pounds (£138,000,000) in 1858 they had risen to two hundred and eighty-one millions, an increase in eighteen years of one hundred and three per cent. In 1840 the total paper money of the United Kingdom was thirty-five millions of pounds; in 1858, thirty-eight millions, an increase of only eight and three-fourths per cent.

A larger proportion of money to values exchanged is necessarily employed in the United States, but the total amount required is not in any proportion to the population, for here the mode of payment by set-off or clearing is rapidly advancing, scarcely requiring money payments to be increased at all in any normal increase of business. Considerable enhancement of the value of paper currency in time of peace always

means excess, and always and quickly heretofore has been followed by commercial disturbances.

The true measure is the actual demand for money service in the legitimate business of the country. When bank credits take the form of currency beyond this point, excess exists. This measure, however, varies with changed conditions. Since the commencement of the rebellion, with its vast increase of business activity in the loyal states, cash payments have prevailed and credits have been nearly abandoned, and we have seen at several periods a scarcity of currency, although four hundred and fifty millions of government currency, with a large amount of other securities in use as money, were added to the usual amount of state bank paper in circulation.

The best apprehension of this great reform of our monetary system, now so well advanced towards its completion, may be had by looking at it in the circumstances in which it was projected. The finances of the Federal Government fell into the hands of Secretary Chase on the 7th of April, 1861. The South was then in a state of insurrection, and the Union on the eve of dissolution. The mere apprehension of these troubles had, months before, so far affected the financial character of the Union that of a loan of ten millions, negotiated by Mr. Cobb, in October, 1860, but seven million twenty-two thousand had been paid into the treasury, the subscribers of two million nine hundred and seventy-eight thousand choosing rather to forfeit their preliminary deposits than accept the stock with the impending risk. Nearly ten millions of treasury notes had been issued in December, 1860, and January, 1861, at varying rates, from six to twelve per cent. interest per annum; six and one-quarter millions of the amount at eleven and twelve, and three and one-quarter millions at ten, ten and one-fourth, ten and one-half, and ten and three-fourths per cent.; and Mr. Secretary Dix sold a loan of eight millions in February, 1861, at an average discount of nine and one-half per cent.

These were but the first symptoms of the storm that broke upon the finances of the country soon after the induction of Mr. Chase. The fall of Fort Sumter, the call of the President for seventy-five thousand troops, the riot at Baltimore, the seizure of forts, arsenals, ship-yards, and sub-treasuries all over the South, the secession of state after state, and the actual commencement of civil war, followed in quick succession.

The effect upon government credit is indicated by the history of the loans offered at this time by the Secretary. For an eight million, twenty year loan at six per cent., put upon the market on the 22d of March, bids were received on the 2d of April, eleven days before the fall of Fort Sumter, ranging from ninety to ninety-five on the hundred. The Secretary refused all below ninety-four, and accepted three millions and ninety-nine thousand, at an average discount of a shade less than six per cent. On May 25th, the bids for a twenty year loan at six per cent. of eight million nine hundred and ninety-four thousand were accepted for seven million three hundred and ten thousand of the amount, at various rates of discount, averaging upon the whole 14.65 per cent.

Congress was convened in extra session on the 4th of July. It authorized loans to the amount of two hundred and fifty millions, and adopted nearly all amendments to the customs tariff recommended by the Secretary, besides passing an act laying a direct tax, which, however, yielded less than two millions in the current fiscal year.

The actual expenditure of that year, ending June 30th, 1862, is now ascertained to have been $570,841.700. The receipts from all sources were $583,885,247, of which aggregate the receipts from loans, treasury notes, and other evidences of debt issued by the treasury, amounted to $529,692,460.

The expenditures of every loyal state were at the same time greatly enhanced, and the fiscal year opened with the disaster of Manassas on the 21st of July. A succession of military reverses during several ensuing months, but above all the sluggishness of the war, and consequent disappointment of the expectation that the rebellion would be extinguished in a single campaign, could not fail to press heavily upon the credit of the government.

The money power of England displayed its distrust or its unfriendliness in advance. The London *Times* declared that loans, which Mr. Chase had not asked, would be refused. Loans at home seemed just then scarcely adequate if the money market were emptied bodily into the treasury. All the causes which affect the price and the negotiability of government stocks were operating in their greatest force. The borrower was a nation rent in twain, with a rebellion on its hands in unexpected strength, and without any certain, much less early, adjustment in prospect. The system of short treasury notes had been carried to the limit of

prudence and availability, and the banks and dealers in capital could not be relied upon for all the demands of the exigency. The associated banks of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia were able to advance, between August and December, one hundred and fifty millions, having been in the meantime reimbursed more than half the amount from the proceeds of the popular subscriptions to the famous seven-thirty loan. But their aggregate capital did not exceed one hundred and fifteen millions. At this time the aggregate circulation of the banks in the loyal states was but one hundred and thirty millions, and their capital three hundred and twenty-seven millions, and the prospective loans for the year required by the treasury were certainly above five hundred millions, with a possible, and since become an actual requirement of similar loans in the fiscal year 1863, to the extent of five hundred and ninety-five millions, and in 1864 six hundred millions more.

Fronting this necessity, Mr. Chase resolved that he would not repeat the experiment of 1812, when the treasury undertook to carry on a war upon state bank issues. Pending the negotiation of loans and advances in August, 1861, the banks required, as conditions upon which they would give the relief required, in that darkest day of financial difficulty: 1st, That no treasury demand notes should be issued; 2d, That the Secretary should draw upon them for the proceeds of the loans and advances directly—thus making them the disbursing agents or paymasters of the treasury, with the power to use their own or other paper currency in payment. The Secretary firmly refused both conditions, on the ground that United States notes must be as good as those of the banks, having the nation's faith and resources pledged for their redemption, and on the further ground that he could not permit the nation's credit and its creditors' interests to pass into hands which he could not control. The banks yielded, and they owe their solvency now to the policy accepted then. The United States notes which he afterwards issued he protected from a relative depreciation by refusing to suspend specie payments at the treasury until after the banks had ceased to redeem their notes; and when the banks afterwards refused to receive the government demand notes, he appealed to Congress, the legal-tender act was passed, and thereupon the banks first agreed to receive and pay them in settlement of clearing-house balances, and long since have learned to hold them at a

higher value than any of the corporation issues of the country.

It was in the midst of this great struggle that he devised and set on foot his revolution of the banking system. Institutions which never did regulate the monetary system, never met the requirements of a circulating medium, even in time of peace, and were absolutely incapable of anything but mischief in time of war, were thenceforth only to be tolerated until they could be thoroughly reformed.

As early as December 9th, 1861, in his first annual report to Congress, he broached his scheme, by reviving the opinion of eminent statesmen, that the emission of banknotes under state authorities fell within the spirit, if not within the letter, of that provision of the Federal constitution which prohibits the emission of bills of credit by the states; but not intending then to attempt a compulsory, and at the same time a sudden and violent withdrawal of their circulation, he contented himself with affirming the authority of Congress to control the credit circulation of the country under its constitutional power to lay taxes, regulate domestic commerce and the value of coin, and declared that in his judgment the time had come when Congress should exercise this authority.

The occasion for trying the constitutional question presented itself in July, 1862. Specie had risen to a premium of twenty per cent., and small change in coin was out of circulation. A fractional currency must be supplied, and Congress authorized an issue by the treasury to meet the want; but the state banks, city and borough corporations, and all manner of institutions were about to flood the country, as in former times, with unlimited quantities of such paper. The Secretary tried the great question by procuring the enactment of a federal law inhibiting such issues by state banks, corporations, or individuals, upon penalty of a heavy fine or imprisonment, or both, at the discretion of the United States courts, in which the parties should be convicted. The rival authorities and competitive interests submitted. The Federal power was thus asserted on the point involved, the principle got a foothold, and a large advance was made towards the ultimate and complete reclamation of the Federal control over the whole currency of the nation.

In December, 1861, the treasury had put into circulation upwards of twenty-four millions of demand notes, and the Secretary contemplated such further increase of them as disbursements in that form might be safely made, provid-

ng a temporary loan for their withdrawal at such times and
o such extent as they might be in excess, and their restora-
ion to the channels of business when they might be requir-
d; but the issue of these notes, and especially the extent
, which, under the pressure of necessity, he afterwards
ailed himself of their service, must not be taken to indi-
ate his policy, either of a system of currency for the use of
ne community, or even as a regular fiscal measure of the
reasury.

Congress did not enact the law establishing Mr. Chase's
ational banking system until February, 1863. In the mean-
me the treasury demand notes (commonly called green-
acks) had worked so well, though outstanding to the
mount of three hundred millions, that Congress and the
ublic were strongly inclined to the plan of substituting
hem as a currency for that of the state banks. Their uni-
orm value throughout the country, and the unquestionable
ecurity of their ultimate redemption, gave them such pre-
erence in the community; and the relief of the nation from
he amount of interest that any other form of public debt
ust bear, commended with equal strength such a substi-
ution to the government. But the Secretary from the first
ay of their issue had never been blind to the hazard and the
ncapacity of this plan of replacing the state banks of issue,
iscount, and deposit. As a necessity, and therefore as a
uty, he employed this form of currency, but took care, both
n his official reports and in his conferences with the asso-
iated banks, to treat it merely as a device for "bridging
ver" the interval between the old system with its evils, and
hat which he recommended for their avoidance in the fu-
ure. He knew and said then, what experience has since
roved, that a government currency has no power, either as
reventive or corrective, to remedy the disorders of the
oney market, induced by causes over which it has no con-
rol. And it was just as clear, or more so, that a national
reasury cannot be converted into a bank of discount or a
ank of deposit, in the way that such institutions are ser-
iceable to the public. Its nearest possible approach to the
equirement is that it can act as a bank of issue, while the
ublic expenditure exceeds its revenue, and to the extent of
uch excess; fluctuating necessarily with all changes of fiscal
ondition in the exchequer, and losing its functions utterly
o soon as the exchequer begins to pay off its debts. All
hat he intended by his United States note system, and all

that he expected from it, moreover all that he feared from it, was clearly stated from the beginning, and it was to guard against its hazards, and possible abuse, that he early and persistently struggled for the establishment of something very different from a national bank, to wit: a national *banking system*. Not a creature of the government, but an agency of the people; not a paper-money factory of the Federal government, but a form or frame-work through which the capital of the people may be employed in their service, under their own guidance, freely, except as it should be overruled for the greatest safety and best uses of industry and commerce. The general features of this system are, in the Secretary's own words:

"1. A circulation of notes bearing a common impression and authenticated by a common authority.

"2. The redemption of these notes by the associations and institutions to which they may be delivered for issue.

"3. The security of their redemption by the pledge of United States stocks, and an adequate provision of specie.

"In other words, a plan for the preparation and delivery to institutions and associations, of notes prepared for circulation under national direction, and secured, as to prompt convertibility into coin, by the pledge of the United States bonds, and by other needful regulations."

The chief distinctive features of this national currency system, as it now stands under the amendatory act of June, 1864, will be seen in the following provisions: A currency bureau is established in the treasury department. Its chief officer is a comptroller under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. He is appointed for the term of five years by the President and Senate. Banking associations may be formed under it by any number of persons not less than five, and they must file their articles of association in the office of the comptroller, embracing the name of the association; the place where its operations of discount and deposit are to be carried on; the amount of capital stock and the number of shares into which it is divided; the names and places of residence of its shareholders, and the number of shares held by each of them.

No association can be organized with a less capital than $100,000, nor in a city where the population exceeds fifty thousand persons, with a less capital than $200,000, except that banks may be formed under special approval of the Secretary, with a capital of not less than $50,000, in any

place where the population does not exceed six thousand inhabitants.

Upon compliance with all the requirements of the act, corporate powers are granted for the term of twenty years to carry on the business of banking by discounting and negotiating promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt; by receiving deposits; buying and selling exchange, coin, and bullion; loaning money on personal security, and by obtaining, issuing, and circulating notes according to the provisions of the act.

These associations are authorized to organize their boards of directors, properly qualified, and to make such by-laws for their government as are conformable to the law. Each shareholder in elections has one vote either in person or by proxy, for each share of stock held by him.

The capital stock is divided into shares of $100 each. These shares with all their incidental rights are assignable, and each shareholder is liable to the extent of the par value of his stock, in addition to the amount invested in such shares, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of the association.

At least fifty per cent. of the capital must be paid in before business can be commenced, and the remainder must be paid in instalments of ten per cent. monthly; after such authorization, the payment of each instalment to be certified to the comptroller, under oath of the president or cashier of the association. All these and other necessary provisions are enforced by the ultimate penalty of appointing a receiver to close up the business of the delinquent association.

Having complied with all preliminary requirements, and before commencing banking business, the association must transfer and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States, United States registered bonds, bearing interest to an amount not less than $30,000, nor less than one-third of the capital stock paid in, increasing such deposit of bonds, as the capital shall be paid up or increased, to the amount of at least one-third of its capital; and any bank may reduce its capital or close up its business by returning to the comptroller the circulating notes issued upon the pledge of such bonds, the bonds pledged to be assigned to the Treasurer of the United States in trust for the association. The interest accruing upon the deposited bonds, is payable to the bank owning them, while it continues to redeem its circulating notes; and if the bonds fall in the market below the amount of the circulation issued for them, the depreciation must be made

) by the bank in other bonds of the United States at their ash value, or in money.

Upon such transfer and delivery of United States bonds he comptroller shall deliver to the bank such quantity of circulating notes, prepared in the treasury department, of various denominations, from one to one thousand dollars, as shall be equal in amount to ninety per cent. of the market value of the bonds so pledged. These notes, all signed by the treasurer and register of the treasury, bear the imprin of the seal of the treasury, and express upon their face th promise of the bank to pay their amount on demand, to b attested by the signature of the president or vice-president and cashier of the bank receiving them; and it is furthe provided that not more than one-sixth part of the note furnished to an association shall be of a less denomination tha five dollars, and after specie payments shall be resumed, association shall he furnished with notes of a less denomination than five dollars.

Such notes, after being signed in such manner as to make them obligatory promissory notes, payable on demand at the place of business of the bank, may be issued and circulated as money, and they shall be received at par in all parts of the United States in payment of taxes, excises, public lands, and all other dues to the United States, except for duties on imports, and shall also be receivable for all salaries and other debts of the United States, except interest on the public debt, and in redemption of the national currency, or United States notes. And no such association shall issue post notes, or any other notes, to circulate as money, than such as are prepared in the treasury and furnished for its issue.

Associations are restricted in the right to hold, purchase, or convey any real estate, other than such as may be necessary for the accommodation of its proper banking business, and such as may be mortgaged, conveyed, or purchased in security or satisfaction of debts; nor can they hold any real estate conveyed, mortgaged, or purchased, for a longer period th five years.

The rate of interest and discount is not to exceed legal rate of the state or territory where the bank is loca and in any state where the rate is not fixed by law, the asso tion shall not charge more than seven per cent. per an under penalty of forfeiting the entire interest so charge double the amount to any party having paid such exc interest.

Nineteen cities are named in which all associations not herein located, shall redeem their circulating notes at par, and each association in the cities named, shall designate an association in the city of New York, at which it will redeem its notes at par, the selection to be made in all cases with the approbation of the comptroller, of which public notice is to be given. Every association formed under this act, must receive at par, for any debt or demand, any and all bills or notes issued by any association existing by virtue of this act. Failure to redeem at the designated place of redemption, works a forfeiture of the banking privileges, and a receiver shall be appointed to close the business of the delinquent association.

The associations in the nineteen designated cities are required to have on hand at all times an amount of lawful money, at least equal to twenty-five per cent. of their circulating notes and deposits, and every other association is required to have on hand at least fifteen per cent. of its circulation and deposits.

Quarterly reports are required in a form prescribed by the comptroller, exhibiting in detail the resources and liabilities of each association before commencing business on the morning of the first Monday of the months of January, April, July, and October, and also monthly statements of the average amount of loans and discounts, specie, other lawful money of the United States, deposits, and circulation, and the amount due to the bank available for the redemption of its circulation at the designated place of redemption.

The expense of printing the circulating notes, and other expenses incurred in executing the provisions of the act, to be paid out of taxes and duties assessed upon the circulation of the association—each association to pay, in the months of January and July, a duty of one-half of one per cent. on the average amount of its notes in circulation, one-quarter of one per cent. each half-year upon the average amount of its deposits, and one-quarter of one per cent each half-year on the average amount of its capital stock beyond the amount invested in United States bonds.

The shares are taxable by the states as personal property, and the real estate held by the associations is taxable by states, counties and cities where located. The total amount of circulating notes to be issued under the act, shall not exceed three hundred millions of dollars.

Associations going into liquidation voluntarily, may, after

one year's public notice, pay into the treasury, in money, the amount of their outstanding circulating notes, and take up their pledged bonds—thereafter the treasury shall redeem and cancel such notes.

Associations failing to redeem their notes in lawful money on presentation at their places of business, or places of redemption, their notes may be protested for non-payment. Thereupon, they shall not pay out any of their notes, discount any notes or bills, or otherwise prosecute the business of banking, except to receive money belonging to them, and deliver special deposits. The comptroller being satisfied of their failure to pay their circulating notes, shall, within thirty days, declare the pledged bonds forfeited, and give public notice to the holders of their notes to present them at the treasury for payment; and upon payment the comptroller shall cancel their equivalent value of the bonds. For any deficiency in the market value of such bonds, the government shall have a prior lien on the assets of the association; and the comptroller in case of such depreciation shall sell the bonds at public auction in New York, and apply the proceeds. For further assurance of the comptroller as to the condition of these associations, he may at his pleasure appoint a visitor to examine and report to him upon all the matters embraced in the act establishing the national currency system. Any existing state bank may become a national association under the act, upon application of the holders of two-thirds of its capital stock. The shares of such bank, after its organization under the Federal act, shall continue of the same amount as before conversion, and the existing officers shall continue until others are elected or appointed under the provisions of the act.

All associations under the act, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be depositaries of public money, except receipts from customs; and may be employed as financial agents of the government, and shall perform such duties as may be required of them as financial agents. All associations designated as depositaries shall receive at par all national currency bills, by whatever association issued, and paid to the government for internal revenue, loans or stocks.

It is easily seen in the provisions of this act, that its central idea is the establishment of one sound, uniform circulation, of equal value throughout the country, resting upon the foundation of national credit combined with pri-

vate capital; intended to effect a transition from a currency heterogeneous, unequal and unsafe, to one uniform, equal and safe, providing an effectual safeguard, if effectual safeguard is possible, against depreciation, and affording complete protection against losses in discounts and exchanges—losses which, under the old system, amounted to probably half the nominal value of the currency issued under it in the last fifty years. The scheme takes no special care of depositors, or other dealers with the banks, but rather takes care that they shall have no power to lessen the ability of the banks to meet fully and promptly the obligations which they contract with the note-holders.

A revolution such as this, springing from an exigency of our great war for the preservation of the Union, will in the next half-century reimburse to the public wealth the whole cost of the strife of arms. The system has, besides, a force to bind the Union together in future, beyond all estimation in value. Every banking association having its bonds deposited in the treasury of the Federal Government, every individual who holds a dollar of the circulation secured by such deposit, and every man whose business success depends upon the credit of that circulation, will be pledged thereby to the maintenance of the national unity. Whatever there is of cohesive power in a public debt, will thus be distributed upon the entire population, in corroboration of all other motives for universal loyalty. Incidental to these higher services, there is also provided by it the happiest adaptation of fiscal agencies that can be imagined in a country of such vast extent of territory, and variety of financial relations with the central government.

The vast range and value of the services provided for in the new system, are, of necessity, as yet, but inductions and expectations. It is responsible for none of the existing disorders of the currency, and its power to remedy them cannot be fairly or fully tested until it has exclusive possession of the field. The aggregate capital which it commands, and the total amount of its circulation, are vastly less than those of the state banks and the government currency, which are still counterworking its agencies; but it has already demonstrated its working power as a mere banking policy. The official reports of the comptroller of the currency, show the following facts:

The first national bank was organized in June, 1863. On the 18th of March, 1865, there were in operation, 908,

with an aggregate capital of $202,844,486. The total circulation furnished by the bureau for their issues, was $104,750,540. Of the aggregate capital, three-fourths belong to former state corporations converted into national associations.

These 908 national banks are located in twenty-seven states and territories—in every loyal region of the Union. Three hundred and twenty-four of them have been organized since the 25th of November, 1864, or in less than four months; at least nine-tenths of these being conversions of state corporations.

The reluctance and resistance of the state banks began to give way in July, 1864. In October, immediately before the re-election of Mr. Lincoln, the result of the political canvass being foreseen, the Philadelphia banks commenced the change, and in November they were all converted. The larger part of the Boston banks yielded about the same time, and now the comptroller describes the applications of the state banks all over the country, as a rush that promises an immediate and universal adoption of the new policy.

The system was born of the rebellion; it has grown in sympathy with, and in dependence upon, the growing success of the Federal arms. Under the auspices of our present able Secretary, it is certain to be matured with the recovered authority of the government of the Union. Mr. McCulloch is entitled to much more credit for the advantages accruing from our present excellent banking system, and the universal confidence with which it has been received, than the public is aware; for he is not a politician or office-seeker, but an unostentatious, thoughtful, business man, whose only care is his duty, and whom the study of years and ample practical experience have made well nigh perfect in the philosophy of currency.

r. IV.—1. *Cowen's Reports.* Vol. vii. Albany, 1828.

Wendell's Reports. Vols. ii. and xiv. Albany, 1829, 1837.

New York Reports. Vols. xv., xx., xxiii., xxiv., xxv. New York, 1858, 1863.

Howard's Reports. Vol. x. Boston, 1851.

Howard's Reports. Vol. xix. Washington, 1857.

Debates, New York State Convention. Albany, 1846.

Forrest Divorce Case. 2 vols. New York, 1863.

WHEN the legal profession maintains its rightful character, is worthy of the highest honor; and that distinction is ely accorded to it in every civilized country. To show t this is founded in reason and justice, needs no elaborate uments. None possess more knowledge than lawyers who properly qualified for their calling; none understand man nature better, and but few can reason so well; in rt, an advocate worthy of the name, is a veritable losopher. It matters little how he attains this standard, e value the classic languages as a means of acquiring owledge more highly than we; but we do not hold that y are the only means, or that the mind cannot be well ined, and the intellect developed and invigorated, with- t them. We value them chiefly for the aid they afford securing those results, for although they cost much e in their study they save much more in other respects. us, if we meet two men whose minds are equally well red and cultivated, one acquainted with the classic lan- ages, the other only with the vernacular, we do not hesitate conclude that the latter has labored harder than the for- r, and is entitled to more credit for having surmounted ious obstacles. The natural inference is that if he had the vantages of the former he would attain to greater emi- nce.

We make these remarks in reply to those who maintain that legal profession in America cannot boast as many great mes as that of any of the principal countries of Europe, ause in the former the study of the classic languages is isted on as a necessary qualification, whereas in the latter student need learn no more Latin or Greek than merely technical expressions used in the profession. That this gation has considerable weight we cannot deny, since it

does not follow that if one or two, or half a dozen, are capable of triumphing over disadvantages, the generality can do so. We are by no means certain, however, that this is the chief cause of certain characteristics of the New York bar, which none denounce or deplore more than leading members of the profession; yet we cannot overlook the influence of the classics in producing studious habits; and there never was a good advocate yet who was not studious. This brings us to the great difficulty of the present day, namely, that nine-tenths of our large army of lawyers never study in any proper sense of the term. Whatever is the cause of this is also the cause of the degeneracy complained of. To this we are to attribute the large proportion of the profession who devote themselves to the lowest *un*professional drudgery—But our object on the present occasion is to show how eminence is attained; not to point out abuses which unhappily are too obvious.

The high esteem enjoyed by lawyers, as we have said, is not that novelty which it is generally supposed to be. Wherever a high degree of civilization has existed, the profession of an advocate has been highly honorable and profitable. If we regard Demosthenes as a representative of the Athenian bar, and Cicero as a representative of the Roman bar, as we are bound to do, what opinion must we form of the state of the profession in each country? That both practised as lawyers in the modern sense of the expression, is beyond question. No people had a finer or more complete system of laws than the Athenians; and next to them in that distinction were the Romans. Both conferred the highest honors on their lawyers; hence it was that the opposition of Demosthenes to Philip was deemed more powerful than that of an army with the most formidable military weapon, and that Cicero was made consul.

On the downfall of the Roman empire jurisprudence suffered like every other science; during the dark ages the Greek or Roman system was scarcely known. It revived gradually with the revival of letters. Until the latter were cultivated to some extent, the lawyers were ignorant; as learning improved so did the lawyers. Hence the common mistake that the benighted ancients had no trained advocates like those we have at the present day.

The country that can boast the first organization of a legal profession after the downfall of Rome is France. There are satisfactory reasons for this. Even while Rome was

istress of the world, Gaul furnished her many of her best wyers; so that she received the title of the nurse of advo-ates (*nutricula causidicorum*). Nor did she furnish lawyers) the Romans alone. "Eloquent Gaul," says Juvenal, "has ught the Britons to become pleaders:"

"Gallia causidicos docuit facunda Britannos."*

nd what the Gauls did for ancient Britain as well as for ome, their kinsmen the Normans did for modern England. ny respectable English history will tell us that the law nguage of England was Norman-French for centuries, from ie time of William the Conqueror to that of Edward III. or the greater part of this long period the majority of the wyers and nearly all the judges were French. Even after ie statute of Edward against the further use of the French s the law language of the country, the lawyers continued) use it in taking their notes, and in their public reports, for early a century. And be it remembered that the technical nguage substituted for the Norman-French, and which was l use for four centuries, was the law Latin, a dialect rmed by the same people; that is, the latter was quite as uch Celtic as the former. Thus it is that, let us look in hat direction we may, we shall find ourselves much more debted to the Celts, especially in all matters pertaining to risprudence and eloquence, than most of us would be will-g to admit; although there is no good reason why any of should deny the fact. Even the Magna Charta was the rk of the Norman barons and Norman clergy.

Since it is thus evident that under one name or another Gauls have in all ages exercised a powerful influence on jurisprudence, it will not be irrelevant to take a rapid nce at the rise and progress of the profession in France, ecially as the principal subject of our present article be-s to that race, and is distinguished by several of the leading s—foibles, perhaps, as well as virtues—for which all res-able historians, from Cæsar to Thierry, readily give them t. The earliest public documents of any importance nd in the archives of France are the capitularies of lemagne, which show that there were lawyers of no pretensions even at that early age; and we find them ming names identical with those discharging similar du-ancient Rome, namely, *causidici clamatores*, *jurisconsulti* , *actores*, &c. Advocates (avocats) practised regularly at

* xv. iii.

all the courts so early as the beginning of the thirteenth century; and Beaumanoir, who gives us their history, informs us that the judges were empowered by law to exclude from their tribunals all who did not possess the prescribed amount of talent and learning.* It was, however, a power which they seldom had to exercise, for the reason that the clergy, who had then nearly all the learning to themselves, were the only persons empowered to act as advocates. That this had a salutary effect on the administration of the law, in England as well as in France, is admitted even by the most violent of the Huguenot writers. But the Church thought it did not do so well for the cause of religion, and accordingly the Council of Lateran interdicted all priests from taking part in any judicial proceedings before lay tribunals. Not long after it was found necessary to promulgate an ordinance requiring lawyers to be *courteous*, *truthful*, and *disinterested*; and none were admitted to plead until they swore that they would conduct themselves as prescribed. This was scarcely a month in operation when a similar ordinance was passed in England; and it was soon after followed by yet another in both countries, which enjoined that no lawyer should abandon a case, in which he had engaged to plead, on account of his not receiving as large a fee as he required. So much had the profession improved at the close of the fourteenth century, that its members belonged almost exclusively to the nobility; and it constituted an order from which were recruited all the principal offices of the kingdom, parliamentary as well as judicial. The careful student of English history need not be informed that it was not long after when lawyers began to obtain similar positions in England; and hence it was that men like Bacon began to turn their attention to the law; and that, since his time, the bench and the bar have been adorned by such jurists as Blackstone, Lyttleton, Coke, Eldon, Mansfield, &c., &c.

We see even from these few passing remarks what a noble prestige is that of the legal profession. It is because so few appreciate it in this light that so few attain eminence. The large majority devote themselves to the law with no higher motive than to secure a livelihood. Nor can we blame them for this on reflection, since it requires genius to grasp the subject in all its bearings. One may be a useful lawyer without being able to comprehend how brilliant are

* An ordinance promulgated by Philippe le Bel, in 1299, contained these words to that effect: *Ad patrocenandum non recepiatis.*

the results which talent, ability, and perseverance are sure to accomplish in the profession; or if he can comprehend it, he may be conscious that he himself lacks the necessary qualifications. If we see one who is capable of realizing what the profession really is, but feels himself surrounded by a thousand difficulties, and yet has the courage not only to aim at eminence, but to persist in seeking it, through evil report and good report, in defiance of all opposition, we are perfectly justified in predicting that he will ultimately succeed; and when he does so he enables us to learn a useful and valuable lesson.

It is for the latter reason that we have chosen as the subject of our present article, Mr. Charles O'Conor, whom we regard not only as the most distinguished representative of this class now living, but also as the most distinguished representative of the New York bar. We address ourselves to this subject as we do to a book or an author, to a system of government or to the country to which it belongs—for the purpose of learning from it whatever we can for the gratification of our readers. We do not speak of him as a personal friend; nay, we can scarcely do so as an acquaintance, since we have never had an interview with him in public or private but once. Nor have we ever sought to avail ourselves of his legal knowledge; and we trust we shall have as little need for it in the future as we have had in the past. These remarks we think it fair to make, although our readers are aware that it is not our habit to make living men, however distinguished, the subjects of papers in the body of our journal. The only other living jurist on whom we have written an elaborate paper is Lord Brougham, ex-High Chancellor of England, and even this was contributed to another periodical at the request of its editor. Those who know us need not be informed that the political opinions of Mr. O'Conor have had no influence in attracting us. None disagree with him more than we on the subject of slavery. We hold his views upon it as radically wrong, not to use any harsher expression. But we are not of those who find no merit in any one who is opposed to their own cherished opinions. Besides, it is not as a politician we mean to consider O'Conor, but as an advocate; if we did otherwise, we should do him injustice, for he cannot be regarded as a politician; he has never been one to any further extent than to give expression to his opinions like other citizens, when called upon by his friends to do so. In one point of view this sim-

plifies our task very much; for there is scarcely any difference of opinion as to his being the ablest and most successful advocate at the New York bar. In the estimation of all disinterested persons, at home and abroad, who are capable of judging, he has occupied this proud rank for the last twenty years. That there are other able lawyers at the present day far be it from us to deny, nor do we deny that there are those whom some regard as equal, if not superior, to him; but we think we are correct as to the general estimate of his talents.

Now, before making any comment on his speeches, or his mode of conducting a case, we will glance at the obstacles against which he had to contend in early life, so that the young and friendless may be encouraged by his success in surmounting them. Even physical labor is valued according to the difficulties by which it is surrounded; before we can determine whether a traveller has acquitted himself well or ill, in performing a journey of a hundred miles in a given time, it is necessary to know the character of the road over which he has had to travel. We therefore give the following brief outline of the early life of Mr. O'Conor, from facts collected from various sources: His father came to this country from Ireland at the beginning of the present century. Although belonging to the O'Conor Don family, whose lineal descent from the last of the Irish kings is beyond dispute,* he was an enthusiastic republican; he was also an uncompromising opponent to British domination; and another prominent feature in his character was his devotion to the Catholic religion. He inherited a handsome property from his father; but being much more charitable than prudent, he was not long in this country when he lost all, and was reduced to extreme poverty. This prevented him from securing for his son that

* Intellectually, also, the same family has been honorably distinguished. Charles O'Conor, who was born in 1710, and who died in 1791, was so eminent an antiquary that he enjoyed the friendship of Dr. Johnson, Dr. Leland, Lord Lyttleton, and several other learned men of that brilliant epoch. His grandson, Dr. Charles O'Conor, brother of the late O'Conor Don, ranks among the most distinguished antiquaries of the present century. He is the author of several works, which exhibit much learning and research. There are none of the principal libraries of Europe in which the following are not to be found: *A Narrative of the most interesting Events in Modern Irish History*, 8vo.; *Rerum Hibernicarum, Scriptores Veteres*, 4 vols. 4to., in Latin; *The Letters of Columbanus*, 2 vols. 8vo.; *Bibliotheca MS. Stowensis*, 2 vols. 4to. The *literary* tastes of the family, combined with its ancient royal lineage, have rendered it a favorite subject for the poets both at home and abroad; thus it is, for example, that one of Campbell's finest effusions is, "*O'Conor's Child, or the Flower of Love lies bleeding.*"

liberal education which it was always his ambition that he should receive. His wife was very different from himself; very much his superior both intellectually and morally; and it was she who had most influence on the future advocate. But she died in 1816, when he was but a mere boy. Her good precepts had their effects, however. Young Charley learned all he could where he could. At school he learned the primary English branches; his father gave him instructions in Latin, and also managed to procure some lessons for him in French. The rest the young student did for himself, although his resources were such as scarcely to afford him a book to learn from, and in 1824 he was admitted to the bar.

The first lawyer with whom he studied is described as "a dreadfully intemperate little West Indian, named Lemoine, who had no regular practice." His next instructor was Joseph D. Fay, whose chief recommendation was not that he knew much about law, or had much practice, but that he had a few good books. O'Conor made the most of these, and of all others belonging to his profession of which he could obtain the use for love or money. It is said that while thus struggling with poverty and its concomitants, he was as proud as a millionaire; but pride is not so reprehensible a feeling as it is generally represented; however, we mean that sort of pride which prevents its possessor from being guilty of a dishonorable action, and which prompts him to be truthful and honest.

In illustration of our remark that Mr. O'Conor is no politician, we will observe, in passing, that, with the exception of serving a summer in the New York Constitutional Convention of 1864, and holding the office of district attorney for some fifteen months, at the request of Franklin Pierce, until he could find a suitable person, he has never held any public office. His friends argue that he has no vanity, or no desire for notoriety, from the fact that he has never lectured, or spoken extemporaneously on any literary, scientific, or professional subject; and that, except in two or three instances, he has never made a public exhibition of himself but with pain and reluctance. We must accept the argument as a cogent one; for although, as already observed, we have never conversed with Mr. O'Conor but once, we parted with him fully satisfied that there are few if any professional men better qualified to deliver an instructive lecture, or an eloquent and interesting extempore address.

We have met with no one on either side of the Atlantic

whose conversational powers seemed to us superior to his, or whose mind seemed better trained, or more analytical. His language is easy, forcible, brilliant, and accurate; and yet he is quite as willing to listen as he is to speak. He is now over sixty years of age, having been born in 1804; his hair and whiskers are entirely grey; his face is pale, but it is more the paleness of thought than of years. At all events, no sooner does he become interested in conversation than his whole countenance brightens, and it is not unfrequently as expressive of his thoughts as his most eloquent periods. Although generally fair and just in his criticisms on men, without betraying the least tinge of envy or jealousy, it is easy to see that he is strong, if not implacable, in his resentments; that keen, grey eye, and thin, compressed lip, with a certain peculiar twitching at the corner of the mouth, reveal this fact, and at the same time remind us of some of the most characteristic descriptions of the ancient Celts.*

It is admitted by all that among the most prominent traits in his character are stern integrity, and a high sense of honor. Although said to be devoid of ambition, no one works harder to avoid defeat than Mr. O'Conor; or perhaps it would be more correct to say that no one exerts himself better or more fearlessly to vindicate his client. Hence it is that one who knows him well, describes his preparations as "paroxysms, and not always short ones."

An experience of forty years at the bar leaves him without a single companion of his early efforts; all are gone, and having no desire to compete with his juniors he avoids practice as much as possible. Except as a jurisconsult,† or in some case of unusual importance, he no longer accepts a brief. As his life has been passed chiefly in solitary labor, seldom appearing in public except in court, his earnestness and zeal have caused many, if not the public at large, to regard him as an unrelenting and cruel spirit. This, indeed, is more or less incident to all lawyers of eminence, since from the very nature of their profession they are always battling against some one, and if they are recluses they can make few intimate friends. This may account for the fact that

* Quod armati (*ita mos gentis erat*) in concilium venerunt.—*Livy*, lib. xxi., c. 20.

† We have seen manuscript copies of opinions of his, in important cases, as a jurisconsult; they are highly interesting as well as valuable, exhibiting an amount of learning, research, and logical acumen, for which few foreigners would give an American advocate credit.

while all acknowledge the eminent ability of O'Conor as an advocate, he has never been popular. We find a curious illustration of the public confidence in his ability as a lawyer, and his integrity as a man, in the fact that many of those who disliked him most, for the reasons mentioned, were among the first who voted for him when he was prevailed upon to become a candidate for the State Convention, organized in 1846, for the formation and adoption of the new constitution. His reply to those who wished him to become a candidate was that he could not be elected a constable; yet, of a half a dozen different factions which exercised political influence at the time, all nominated him, with the sole exception of "the workingmen," whose rules allowed them to nominate only a working man; and the result was that he was almost unanimously elected.

His course as a member of the convention afforded the best evidence that he had no taste for political intrigue, but that he was self-willed, and would cling with tenacity to any idea, however unpopular, which he thought right. The politicians saw that they could neither convince, coax, nor bribe him, and consequently had to give him up as unmanageable. But the same untractableness that made him thus odious to men in power, or to those having sanguine hopes of soon acquiring it, rendered him quite a favorite with hopeless minorities; and this character he has sustained to the present day. As an example of the tenacity with which he clung to what he thought right while a member of the convention, we will extract a passage from his speech on the proposed section of the constitution relative to the separate property of married women. It will be seen that this shows that if he is not a politician, he has statesman-like views; at least in regard to one kind of "slavery." If he were as logical and just in his views of negro slavery as he is on that sort of bondage under which our women have to labor at the hands of their husbands, we should have no fault to find with him; and we imagine that the most sensible of the sex themselves would regard him in a similar light. Omitting some prefatory remarks we quote as follows:

"If there was anything in our institutions that ought not to be troubled by the stern hand of the reformer, it was the sacred ordinance of marriage and the relations arising out of it. The difference, he said, between the law of England and that of most other nations, was that it established the most entire and absolute union and identity of interests and of persons in the matrimonial state. It recognised the husband as the head of the household, merged in him the legal being of the wife so thoroughly, that in contemplation of law she could scarcely be said to exist. The

common law of England was the law of this country, and both were based upon the gospel precept—"they twain shall be one flesh." Pure as its origin—the fountain of holy writ—the common law rule upon this subject had endured for centuries; it had passed the ocean with our ancestors, and cheered their first rude cabins in the wilderness; it still continued in all its original vigor and purity, and with all its originally benign tendency and influences, unimpaired by time, undiminished in its capacity to bless by any change of climate or external circumstances. Revolution after revolution had swept over the home of married love, here and in the mother country; forms of government had changed with Proteus-like versatility; but the domestic fireside had remained untouched. Woman, as wife or as mother, had known no change of the law which fixed her domestic character and guided her devoted love. She had as yet known no debasing pecuniary interest apart from the prosperity of her husband. His wealth had been her wealth; his prosperity her pride, her only source of power or distinction. Thus had society existed hitherto. Did it need a change? Must the busy and impatient besom of reform obtrude, without invitation, its unwelcome officiousness within the charmed and charming circle of domestic life, and there too change the laws and habits of our people? He trusted not. He called upon not only husbands, but brothers, sons,—all who held the married state in respect, to pause and deliberate before they fixed permanently in the fundamental law this new and dangerous principle. No change should be made in the rules affecting the relation of husband and wife. The habits and manners built upon these rules, and arising out of them, could not be improved, and ought to be perpetuated. The firm union of interest in married life, as established by the common law, occasionally, in special cases, produced deplorable evils, but its general influence upon the members of society was most benign. This was exhibited in the past history of England and our own country; it was visible in the existing condition of our people. Why change the law, and by a rash experiment put at risk the choicest blessings we enjoy? Husbands in America are generally faithful and true protectors of their wives; wives in America are generally models for imitation. The least reflection must convince that this state of manners amongst us results from the purity of our laws for domestic government. These laws ought not, then, to be changed, lest manners should change with them. The proposition came in an insidious and deceitful form; it came with professions of regard for woman, and thus won a ready access to the favor of all good men; but like the serpent's tale to the first woman, it tended, if it did not seek, to betray her. He thought the law which united in one common bond the pecuniary interests of husband and wife should remain. He was no true American who desired to see it changed. If it were changed, and man and wife converted, as it were, into mere partners, he believed a most essential injury would result to the endearing relations of married life. A wife with a separate estate secured to her independent disposal and management, might be a sole trader; she might rival her husband in trade, or become the partner of his rival. Diverse and opposing interests would be likely to grow out of such relations; controversies would arise, husband and wife would become armed against each other, to the utter destruction of the sentiment which they should entertain towards each other, and to the utter subversion of true felicity in married life.

* * * * * * * * * *

"This was the opinion of pure-minded Joseph Platt, of the venerable, wise, and profoundly learned Ambrose Spencer. If this Convention should change the laws, invade the sanctuary of domestic love, and en-

trench within it the fiend, pecuniary self-interest, he believed it would ultimately change the whole character of the married relation in our country. He spoke for posterity, not for the present generation. If the members of this Convention, and the people, acted unwisely in this matter, they would go down to the grave unpunished; for the evil would not come in their day. Laws might be changed in an instant, but manners could neither be formed nor subverted suddenly. The present tone of society in this respect was too well fixed to be soon changed. It was the result of centuries of human existence under a wise law. The wives and the husbands of the present day would retain the manners that law had created, long after the law itself was abolished. But if this new rule should be adopted, the student of history in after times would condemn the act. From amid the less pure and incorrupt habits and manners of domestic life as then existing around him, he would look back to the present day, with emotions akin to those which affect our minds when contemplating the first family, in happy Eden, before the tempter came." *Debates, New York Convention*, 1846, *pp.* 907–8.

Now, in view of the large increase in divorce suits and litigations of different kinds between man and wife in the state of New York during the last nineteen years, who can deny that some of the most serious predictions of Mr. O'Conor have been but too literally fulfilled?

It is not our habit to treat any subject without having carefully examined it, but we have found it a serious affair to trace the labors of Mr. O'Conor, extended, as they are, over such a vast space. Although some of his greatest cases are reported only in the newspapers, we have read more or less of his pleadings in not fewer than forty octavo volumes, not to mention at least a score of pamphlets. We need hardly say that we have not been able to give more than a cursory glance at the majority of them; for we could not have examined all in the time we can devote to a whole number of our journal. This must be our apology for any errors or inaccuracies which may occur in our article; we trust we may also urge it as a reasonable excuse, if it be found that we do not perfectly understand our subject, or that our estimate of him is not such as the facts justify; especially as we do not pretend to be infallible, and are always willing to modify any opinions which we find, on more mature reflection, to be erroneous.

The name of Mr. O'Conor first appears in our law reports as junior counsel, associated with the Hon. Jonas Platt, who was previously, in what may be regarded as its Augustan period, a judge of the Supreme Court; his opponents being Dudley Selden, junior, and the celebrated Thomas Addis Emmet, senior. It was an important election case which took

place in 1827.* His first reported argument is in the case of Diver *v.* McLaughlan, in the Supreme Court in 1829; one of so much importance that its nature and tendency are commented upon by our leading commentators on American law.† His greatest cases are the Lispinard will case, in 1843, the John Mason will case in 1853, the Parish will case in 1862, the Lemmon slave case in 1856, the case of the slave Jack in 1835, &c. We need hardly mention the famous Forrest divorce case, as one of his greatest, since its character is known to all. For the same reason we will speak of some other cases before it. Among his latest are those of Curtis *v.* Leavitt,‡ Canjolle *v.* Ferrie,§ United States *v.* Castellero.‖ The latter cases involved sums varying from $100,000 to millions. Some had very peculiar points, and engaged the greatest legal talent of the whole country. Of this character is that of Barnard *v.* Adams, reported in 10 Howard's United States Reports.¶ The argument, printed under the name of Boardman, but written by Mr. O'Conor, although the great Daniel Webster was engaged on the same side, has often been quoted in Europe as well as in this country;** and a similar

---

* 7th Cowen's Reports, p. 153.
† See 2 Kent's Commentaries, p. 538-9.
‡ 15 N. Y. Reports, p. 9.
§ 23, N. Y. Reports, pp. 110.
‖ 2 Black's Reports.
¶ p. 270.

** As some of our legal readers at a distance may not have seen this, and as it is also interesting to owners and masters of vessels and insurance companies, we subjoin an extract from it.

The first question in this case is of the highest importance in point of principle. The error of the judgment under review seems self-evident. It is indeed a paradox. It amounts to this: that if a navigator, whose ship is inevitably doomed to loss by stranding, should consult his own judgment, and select, for his compulsory voyage to the shore, the route least perilous to himself and his vessel, such preference for the safer course is the incurring of a voluntary sacrifice, which entitles him to compensation.

Or it may be stated in this way: a mariner, whose ship is thus inevitably doomed, cannot avoid becoming entitled to contribution in general, unless he blindly forbears all action whatever, or navigates with an express view and purpose to effect the destruction of the adventure. Neither reason nor authority affords support to this extraordinary doctrine.

General average is founded on the simple principle of natural justice, that where two or more parties are concerned in a common sea risk, and one of them makes a sacrifice for the common safety, the loss shall be assessed upon, in proportion to the share of each in adventure; and the greatest sacrifice of the first shall be compensated by the contribution of the others. Taylor *v.* Curtis, 1 Holt's N. P. Cas. 192 note. 8 Eng. Com. Law Rep. 69. Its origin is commonly traced to the Rhodian law *de jactu*, which named only the case of a jettison; and although the rule is not to be considered as thus limited, yet the case there put is an apt illustration, and no case essentially different from this illustration can fairly be considered within the rule. Goods cast overboard in a storm to lighten the vessel, masts, spars, or rigging cut away to prevent her being driven ashore, or carried away in an effort to avoid, by some unusual

. will apply to one of his arguments in the Parish will The peculiar force of the latter seems to have been all. Chief Judge Selden, who presided in the Court peals on the occasion, gave a quotation from Mr. or's speech, as follows:

counsel for the respondents, James and Daniel Parish, evidently force of this aspect of the case, and we will see how he meets it. ing of Mrs. Parish, and the frauds and contrivances by which, as , she obtained the execution of the codicils, he says: 'We l her watching her husband's person day and night, never per- any intercourse between him and others, which might reveal the dition of his mind. We shall find her interpreting, according to purposes, his signs and gestures to selected persons, chosen to s nominal intercourse with him. We shall find her preparing sons to play the humble part of dupes, by appeals to their self- or their vanity, or by palpably untrue representations and im- practised upon them. We shall find her desecrating to the pur- fraud and deception, the sacred name and the sacred observances on, the holy cause of charity. *We shall find her ensnaring her own spectable kinsmen in such a net-work that they are at length con- in desperation, to become the instruments of her will, to forget, to pre- to misrepresent. The learned and eminent counsel is drawn in by les, the pious minister by another; the sexton falls by one piece of the bank president and the president of the Bible Society by another, lly, to fill up, by direct and unmistakable untruth, every remaining the barricade behind which her plunder was to be entrenched, a des- nderer from truth and rectitude is obtained as a witness, and in- out-Herod Herod.*'

is almost forcible and eloquent summary of the positions which it bent upon the respondents to maintain, in order to invalidate licils for the want of testamentary capacity. The counsel is right in his conception of the burdens which the case imposes n. He sees that it is quite impossible that all these intelligent s should have failed to detect idiocy if it existed, and has taken ion accordingly. These positions are maintained by a vigor of

---

n impending calamity, running a ship on shore to avoid capture, slip- ble or an anchor for general safety, are the usual instances found in cases. Perkins's Abbott on Shipping, 480, notes. They are all with- stration given in the Rhodian law; and, upon principles of natural e proper cases for contribution.

en a ship does no more than pursue that course of navigation which, ent of the good or evil thence resulting to cargo, is most safe for her- can she be said to encounter a peril or incur a loss for the benefit of ? This is not answered by the precedents of allowance for parts of or her tackle jettisoned for common benefit; because although it proper to make such sacrifice for the benefit of the ship alone, were y, yet the act is the separation and destruction of a part for the benefit mmunity of interests, which still remain as such contending against the danger. Not so, when the ship is run ashore as the safest direction n be given to her; then the whole community goes together, taking direction and encountering the same peril. It is a mere accidental t the ship suffers more than the cargo.

utus was not voluntarily sacrificed. On the contrary, she was lost by and unavoidable operation of a *vis major*, unaided by any volition or ncy of man.

logic, a force of rhetoric and a perfection of art which, I cannot refrain from saying, has in my judgment rarely been surpassed."—*New York Reports*, vol. xxv., pp. 108-9.

In examining some of the principal cases, we have found several that are interesting in various points of view. One is particularly curious; it shows, among other things, that clients sometimes know how to appreciate the labors and abilities of their counsel, even when the court decides against them. It appears from the reports before us that two gentlemen named Barron possessed a quicksilver mine in California. A scheme was contrived to deprive them of it by imputations of fraud on their part. Officials of the government became interested in the success of this device. Witnesses were subpœnaed and the record was filled with perjuries; but the claim seemed destitute of plausibility, and the courts of California decided in favor of the Barrons. An appeal was taken. The main reliance of the claimants seemed to be that the record was too voluminous to be read, and that if forgery were boldly and persistently urged it might be believed. The claimants wished to present the strongest inducements to witnesses and others to be as favorable as possible. With this view they formed a joint stock company with a nominal capital of $8,000,000, their claim to the quicksilver mine constituting such capital. Thus, 80,000 shares of the stock were put afloat on the market, which would be worth nothing if the Barrons succeeded, but worth par if they were defeated. Any one could buy shares for two or three dollars apiece; many enjoying favorable positions could buy a lot of them for sixpence apiece, or if not afraid to accept, could get them for nothing.

This record was placed in the hands of Mr. O'Conor by the Barrons, with a retainer to argue the appeal. To him the whole difficulty seemed to be to condense and arrange the contents of the record; so unwieldly was the mass of foreign laws, foreign languages, and foreign practices. The person who got up the record was dead; his successors may not have had time, if they had the inclination, to scrutinize it. At all events, they failed to do so; they took his word that it contained ample proof of guilt on the part of the Barrons. By incessant toil, patiently pursued for a long time, O'Conor reduced the chaos to order, and rendered it so plain that no intelligent person could fail to be convinced of the utterly frivolous character of the evidence. Even that of the subpœnaed witnesses tended to show that the title of the Barrons

was good and genuine. A single paper having an unfavorable bearing was introduced at a late period of the investigation, but on cross-examination it was admitted to be a fabrication. No use for the Barrons, however. The claimants had laid their plans well; and they gained their case. By this curious decision the Barrons were deprived, not to say robbed, of millions of dollars. In the midst of their mortification and chagrin, being still wealthy, they requested their counsel to present his claim for services. It seems that what he claimed would be considered a liberal fee in any part of the world, even for the vast amount of labor he had performed. Gold was then at a premium of fifty-four per cent.; but the Barrons sent a draft on their bankers, payable in gold, for several thousand dollars more than the amount asked.

As mentioned already, we have always been opposed to Mr. O'Conor's views on the subject of slavery, but we have sought to do him the justice of bearing in mind that he formed them in his professional capacity. A very wide distinction must be made between one who devotes himself to the propagation or maintenance of slavery as a politician, and one who merely argues a slave case as an advocate. If it be urged that because a lawyer becomes the champion of slaveholders it must be held that he has sympathy with slavery, must it not also be held, on the same ground, that he who is in the habit of defending murderers must have a sympathy with murder? Although it would have afforded us much pleasure to see Mr. O'Conor devote his efforts in favor of slavery to a different cause, we do not feel the less bound to give a fair estimate of those efforts, especially when we bear in mind that they have always been influenced by patriotic motives. Mr. O'Conor thought that opposition to slavery would sooner or later lead to bloodshed and rebellion; and that whatever good might result from abolition, it would not compensate for the evil of war and the dissolution of the Union. If he was wrong in this, so were our greatest statesmen and patriots, including Webster and Clay, and even the illustrious Washington himself.

At all events, it is not as a quasi-philanthropist or politician that we are considering Mr. O'Conor, but as an advocate. As such his arguments against the poor negro have been but too powerful; they surpass all others that we have read in any language, ancient or modern. In short, wherever arguments were to be found, in sacred or profane history, in

favor of the "peculiar institution," they were carefully collected, and ingeniously and eloquently applied by Mr. O'Conor. At no time for the last twenty years has this course been popular in New York, or indeed in any part of the North; but for the last seven or eight years it has been decidedly unpopular. This no one knew better than he; and instead of being discouraged by it he has not unfrequently turned it to the benefit of his client. Thus, for example, in his closing argument in the Lemmon slave case, the following passage occurs:

"I will now make a few remarks in reply to the argument on the general subject of negro slavery. On that topic, my learned friends enjoy, in this latitude, the privilege of saying as many witty things as they please, with the certainty of receiving applause from a portion of their auditors. It requires but little firmness to speak in the midst of a friendly circle, and in conformity with its opinions. It requires but little effort of the imagination to introduce, in such a position, tropes and figures that will please those who surround us, and that will draw forth exhibitions of an adverse sentiment towards the stranger who may be present, seeking a disfavored right, or against the advocate who may venture to assert that right in his behalf. This privilege my learned friends enjoy. They are welcome to it. I am sure I could not, here, turn the laugh upon them; and I would not wish to do it if I could. For, in my opinion, at this time, under the circumstances by which we are surrounded, the honorable citizen who can laugh on this subject must first forget his moral duty. He may have an honest heart and a good understanding, but for the time he must be insensible to the just influences of either. The question before us is not a laughing matter.—*Rep. of Lemmon Slave Case, N. Y. Court of Appeals*, p. 115.

One of O'Conor's greatest merits as an orator is, that he addresses himself to no subject without embodying principles and inculcating precepts to which all must assent, and which, let their application in any particular instance be what it may, are undeniably instructive and suggestive in themselves; and we think it may be added that he owes much of his success as an advocate to the same characteristic. Thus all will admit that the speaker who has public opinion on his side, as intimated in the extract just quoted, can please and consequently convince his audience much more easily than one placed in the opposite position; and the fact, when judiciously introduced, as in this case, cannot fail to influence the jury. The opponents of the pro-slavery advocate very naturally seek to avail themselves of the favorable position in which they are placed; but with the skill of a dexterous fencing-master he parries their thrusts as follows:

"So much for that argument. It is illegitimate, and unsound.

"My learned friend who last addressed the Court, has also observed that this case was presented to your consideration on my part, with soft phrases

ıtricate sentences; that much had been said with a purpose to draw ion, or which had the effect of drawing attention away from the t in hand, and that I had avoided a reference to general principles. sal confidently to your Honors' judgment whether my course in this ıent has not been mainly a reference to general principles, and ıer it has not been marked by a desire to avoid mere details. If it e that I have fallen into the vice, or adopted the virtue—whichever it e called—of using over-soft phrases, I ought surely to be forgiven, is my first offence. And as to intricate sentences, if I have offended t way, it certainly verifies the saying, that a certain kind of com- ıation has a certain effect upon manners. It is a new thing in my lence to be accused of uttering soft phrases, and as to the relative rtion of intricate sentences uttered in this debate, I think I can safely t to a comparison. In that particular, at least, the learned counsel e found to have far excelled. If the argument presented on our n this case is remarkable for anything, it is for the simple point- directness with which it meets the emergency. On this head I con- ly appeal to the closest scrutiny. Intricate sentences! My learned has not read a sentence from our brief, or pointed out a single in- y. Our argument may be all wrong, but it is direct. It is unmis- le in its import; it is easily understood. Whether it can be easily d, your Honors, or some authoritative tribunal, will determine."—*1 L. S. C., p.* 117.

ıut however much we may blame Mr. O'Conor for the ɜrful aid he has given the cause of slavery by his su- ır talents, we must admit that, after all, his most power- forts are those in favor of the weak against the strong. :oof of this we need only mention two of his numerous , namely, that of Richard G. Fowles *v.* Henry C. Bowen, hat of Catharine N. Forrest *v.* Edwin Forrest. In the ɜr he appears as the advocate and vindicator of a poor sought to be disgraced and ruined by his employer; in atter, as the advocate and vindicator of a woman sought cast off and disgraced by her husband. In neither case ıe any adequate pecuniary reward to expect; even his ıies are obliged to acquit him, however reluctantly, of ılfish motive in both cases. He believed Mr. Fowles, as as Mrs. Forrest, to be innocent; and accordingly he did his for him as well as for her, and with a result equally suc- ıl as far as it went. Both trials are still fresh in the ic memory, for each awakened a profound interest.

; will be remembered that a wealthy merchant of this city one of his clerks a good written character on parting with and at the next opportunity represented him in the worst ble light to his new employer. The party who acted was sued for defamation; a verdict for six thousand rs was rendered for the plaintiff, but it was set aside by ourt. The plaintiff then brought the case to the supe- court and secured the services of Mr. O'Conor, who, in

spite of all the influence the wealthy defendant could command, procured a verdict of $4,500. We can only make room for a brief extract or two from his argument, but even these will show that the subject of our article did his duty fearlessly and effectually. Passing over the statement of the case and other introductory matter, we come to that part in which the counsel speaks of the value of character, and quote as follows:

"Mr. Bowen's counsel says the law does not favor actions for slander. This I deny. I have always supposed that this action was eminently favored by the law for the protection which it affords to reputation. Reputation is, of all human possessions, the most valuable. An approving conscience is the only thing in the wide circle of man's interest which should be more highly estimated. That is not a subject of human laws, for it is not a human possession; it is a thing divine; it belongs to the world within us, and to the world to come; not to the class of mere human interests. Reputation is of this world. It is the approval of our neighbor. It is the estimation in which he holds us. It is the word which he utters in respect to us. It is indeed worldly; and of worldly treasures, you will agree in pronouncing it the most estimable. Who will deny this assertion? Are marble palaces, or is the ownership of them—are armies of clerks, or is the mastery of them—is eminence for wealth, for talent, for acuteness—is life itself, the sum of earthly things, more valuable than reputation?"—*Argument of Charles O'Conor on behalf of plaintiff, Pamphlet, p.* 11.

The counsel for the defendant having alleged that the law did not favor actions for slander, Mr. O'Conor proceeded to reply in the following strain of refined irony and indignant invective:

"Gentlemen, it is an action favored by the law. I grant that it is an action somewhat disfavored, as a professional pursuit, by gentlemen who, like my learned friends on the other side, are blessed with the smiles of fortune. They seldom appear in a court of justice as the champions of a poor man's wounded reputation. I must confess as much for myself; but in making this case an exception to my usual course, I feel that I am fully justified; in undertaking and presenting this case to you, I am quite sure that I have not departed from any principle of prudence or of honor. On the contrary, in a certain humble measure, I feel conscious of having entitled myself to the approval of all honest men.

"We have been compelled to listen to observations of the learned counsel, entirely unwarranted by evidence, about 'tricks, devices, and contrivances,' imputed to Mr. Fowles. And what is the foundation of all this? Why, you are told that there have been published in the newspapers certain remarks unfavorable to Mr. Bowen. The truth of this I doubt not, though I have never seen the publications alluded to. But are we responsible for these criticisms on the misconduct of the defendant? If a man will so demean himself as to outrage the general sense of the community, is he therefore not to be arraigned in a court of justice? Is he therefore to escape all legal responsibility, and is the injured party to be restrained by the very indignation which his wrongs have excited in the public breast, from demanding justice before a court and jury against the transgressor?

"Reference has also been made to something like an outburst of applause aving occurred here in court. I am inclined to believe that the act was advertent. It is a natural impulse to give an outward mark of approbaon to that which has our inward approval. We are not censurable beuse Mr. Fowles' course is approved, and that of Mr. Bowen is condemned public sentiment. We are not responsible for the criticisms of the ress or the indignant censures of the community. Neither have been cited by our conduct."

Although more than the whole space originally intended r the present paper is already filled, we must make room for nother passage from this speech, because it is characteristic the adroit, telling manner in which, without any affectaon of wit or humor, Mr. O'Conor quietly turns the laugh ainst the opposing counsel, while placing in relief, as if by cident, the worst points in the conduct of their client, and hat is most favorable to his own:

"The counsel (Mr. Cutting) wishes to avail himself of the fact stated in r opening, that Mr. Fowles has here in court a brass stamp, which was d by Bowen & McNamee for the purpose of labelling their goods with e name of a foreign manufac turer of high credit, thereby to deceive and alead their customers. He says we stated that fact, 'and therefore,' ds he, 'Fowles must have stolen the brass stamp, although all the rest his story is mere fabrication.' He stole it from Bowen & McNamee, t all the rest of the story is false! That is to say, Fowles stole this mp from Bowen & McNamee, though Bowen & McNamee never had it! ughter). My associate says they used it. 'That,' says our opponent, deny. As there is no proof that we ever had, ever owned, or ever ed this counterfeiter's device, you must hold that part of Fowles' story be a vile fabrication. But, on the other hand, there is the stamp itself. ow did he come by it? He must have stolen it from Bowen & McNamee. n his own confession he is a thief.' This is what the learned gentleman lls 'taking a leaf from our book.' "—*Ib., pp.* 15, 16.

Fortunately, it is not necessary to do more than to allude one so familiar to all as the Forrest case, for an lequate review of Mr. O'Conor's speech alone would fill the hole space we have devoted to this paper. It is certainly great effort, although there is nothing pretentious about it; makes no parade of learning, but it is, nevertheless, in ccordance with the principles laid down by the best judges om Demosthenes and Aristotle to Quintilian and Blackone, of what forensic oratory ought to be. Every classical tudent will remember what stress the Stagyrite lays on the mportance of conciliating the good will of the judge and ury.* We know no advocate who acts upon this precept ith more consummate skill, or more happy effect, than Ir. O'Conor. The following passage is, indeed, not the best

* See Aristotle's Rhetoric, Book II., c. i.

specimen we could give in proof of this, but we think it is quite sufficient to justify our estimate of his ingenuity in that respect:

"Now, sir, I conceive it to be altogether in character; and following out the probably commendable, and certainly very prudent course of my adversary, I deem it proper to impute that remark, not to him, but to his instructions—not as emanating from himself, but as passing through him—the mere conduit, the voice, the language, the observation of his client. Now, sir, I say this is the last impropriety as yet; I have a hope that there will be another, and I confidently hope that, as all the persons who have come within the sweep of this party's moral sabre have received a stroke, even up to your Honor—I say I have a confident hope that twelve other individuals will receive a suitable denunciation consequent upon the justice—the integrity—the righteousness of their verdict. And it is only necessary for me to add that, as to other improprieties, I fear them not. Now, sir, I observe on this for the reason I have stated. I observe on it because it has a tendency to deprive my client of a right before this jury. If your Honor please, there have stood, during some five or six long weeks, two advocates, members of the legal profession, who come in each as the champion of his party, each imbued—honestly as the counsel on the other side says, and I am bound to think—honestly imbued with confidence in the righteousness of his client's cause, but each, of course, liable to the deepest prejudices; liable to be greatly misled; each liable to use a course of argument unfounded in reason, tinctured by affection, colored by passion. How is this jury to decide between us? How, if I make a statement of evidence directly contradictory to the counsel on the other side—how, if I pursue a course of argument founded on some principle of law to illustrate this case, widely different from the course of argument that I ought to adopt—how, I would ask your Honor, are these jurors to find an umpire and an arbiter between us, but in your Honor? I have expected through this case, sir, from the very commencement, that every just, honorable and upright man in the community would be deeply imbued, I may say, with violent prejudices against the case of this defendant, up to the time one or two of his own witnesses were examined. I have expected, sir, that that calm, enlightened, and intelligent judgment, which for five and twenty years has presided in this court with universal satisfaction, manifested not only under the old system by the highest authority in the state, but, more recently, by the majesty of the people itself.

"I have, I say, sir, expected that that enlightened judgment, which no man ever doubted—which rarely has a jury ever differed with—which we have all at the bar uniformly known to be so impartial, so just, so enlightened, in its views of evidence and in the law, so reasonable, so marked with that plain Saxon common sense which goes straight home to the hearts of men, and carries conviction to them; so marked with that love of justice that knows no faltering, so that it has commanded universal admiration—I did expect, sir, though I pretend to no personal claims on your consideration—though my client is a total stranger to you, sir, and a total stranger to all public men—people like yourself—I have expected from the outset, that that common justice which for five and twenty years all parties litigant in this court have received at your hands, would have been meted out to us in this case, and that, if the evidence in this case made certain impressions on the mind of your Honor, that, calmly, dispassionately, freely, and fearlessly, as heretofore, you would put the case to this jury, and whenever the learned counsel on the other side and myself are in conflict—such a conflict as would be regarded material by your

onor—that the scale would be made even between us, and the right pre-nted to this jury, not, to be sure, for their absolute governance, but for eir aid among conflicting arguments. I do trust—I do hope—I do pray—y, I demand, as a matter of justice on the part of one of the most helpless d friendless individuals—so far as the management of a case in a court of stice is concerned—who has ever appeared in this court, that your Honor ill feel the impropriety of this remark as to unfriendliness, and that you ill not be turned aside from the performance of that duty from which I ever believe you have shrunk; and that on this occasion, disregarding at or any other observation—utterly forgetting it—you will go to this ry with the impressions which the evidence has made on your mind, nfluenced and unswayed by this gross impropriety."—*New York Herald's Report of Forrest Divorce Case, p.* 157.

That this had its effect not only on judge and jury, but n the public, none acquainted with the circumstances will eny. But perhaps the most telling, as well as the most loquent, part of this truly noble effort is that in which the rator exposes the pure and virtuous pretensions of Forrest to ublic derision and scorn. There is a startling earnestness in his whole criticism, but we can only give a small fragment r two. They, however, need no introduction; they fully xplain themselves.

"But now look at the other side. How far is it probable, that for the ere purpose of enabling his wife to talk about the circumstance, or for he purpose of screening her in the eyes of the servants, that Mr. Forest would submit to the monstrous degradation of lying every night for our months, by the side of one whom he had proved and found to be a hameless harlot, in dishonorable and lascivious communication with a an whom he knew, as he stated in his affidavit, to be a vile wretch, but whom, notwithstanding, he introduced to the society of his wife, and sed to leave alone with her on many occasions. Certainly he did so on ne. I ask you, is this credible? Why, what a patient, mild, innocent, elf-denying creature this must be, who, when he found his wife unchaste, and was determined to punish her on that account, still, in order o salve and save her character, and to screen her from disgrace, would ay his pure and uncontaminated person on the same bed for four long nonths? Do you believe it? Is it credible? I submit, gentlemen, that he fact of his thus occupying the same chamber for four months is conclusive evidence that he did not believe anything whatsoever to the disparagement of his wife. But he says he did; and yet he admits that he ntended to separate from her. He made not a single charge against her, nd stood ready, as her champion, to defend her honor, if anybody would assail it. That he admits, and strange enough it is. But let us see how they stood on approaching the 1st of May, 1849, when the separation must take place—when the separation did take place—his establishment being then broken up. What are his acts at that time? They are very kind towards her. In April he took her out to ride. Her own picture—the picture of a degraded harlot—whom he was about to turn from his side, is sacredly preserved among his family treasures, and transmitted to the mansion of Fonthill, to grace its walls whenever it shall come into use. His own picture—the family picture; the picture of the man whom she had degraded and dishonored—he, with his own hand, carries to the carriage, accompanies her, and in the face of day and of their friends,

delivers her that picture, to keep as a keepsake and evidence of unbroken connection with the original. They part as lovers; not, to be sure, with a broken sixpence, each retaining half, but keeping each the picture and image of the other, to be treasured and preserved as an evidence that there was still an attachment between them, unbroken, at least, by crime or shame. Does it admit of any other construction? No, gentlemen."—*Report of Forrest Divorce Case, pp.* 165, 166.

The advocate then proceeds to show how the defendant had placed his wife in the family of Mr. Bryant, and on this he makes the following comment:

"He (Mr. Forrest) after these four months' contemptible disguise, covering his own shame to blind the eyes of Dame Underwood and Robert Garvin—the tell-tale Dame Underwood—wound up by taking this contaminated woman and placing her at the pure hearth of that pure, honorable, most respected, and most respectable family. I should like to know has any man a right to come into a court of justice and call his wife polluted, and demand a divorce from her, who could be guilty of such inconceivable baseness as to ask her to go to a young couple (the wife being the daughter of a dear and ancient friend,) living in peace, happiness, and honor, and plant at their hearth a vile creature, reeking with the abomination of a filthy crime—who, in all probability, would pollute whoever touches her. Why, if Mr. Edwin Forrest had done this, he would be infinitely a worse man than perhaps ever I ought to esteem him—for there is a kind of philosophy by which people think they have a right to do what they please with their own, and as this woman was his wife, why, perhaps he may have thought that he had a right to do with her what he pleased, and to cast her from him, innocent though she were. But I know no man who conceives that he has a right to plant a thorn of guilt and infamy in the garden of his neighbor—and Mr. Forrest is not guilty of this offence. I claim for him and for human nature, that he is not guilty of it; and from the fact that he is not guilty of this offence, I ask you to convict him of another, and different, and far less heinous, perhaps less inexcusable, offence against morality and justice—that of condemning unjustly his innocent wife."—*Ib., p.* 166.

Rarely, if ever, has logic been more dexterously used than in this passage; all the circumstances which tell against the defendant are so artfully arranged, but without the least appearance of art—nay, without any apparent effort—that the conclusion of the orator is absolutely irresistible. Those who heard this speech and were capable of appreciating its influence had no doubt of the result; this will be the more easily understood if it be borne in mind that although that before us is better than most reports, it gives but a feeble idea, as we well remember, of the impression made by the living, burning words as they fell from the orator's lips, rendered doubly eloquent and persuasive by the looks and gestures with which they were accompanied. None who heard the greater part of his speech, as we did, were surprised to learn that when the case was terminated nearly all the leading lawyers of New York—about sixty in number—

ited in presenting Mr. O'Conor with a valuable piece of ver, bearing a highly eulogistic inscription. Had we been ong the particular friends of Mrs. Forrest, those who garded her as a much injured woman, it might be said at we were disposed to place an undue estimate on the labors hich secured her triumph; but although we are no admirers Mr. Forrest, and have but little respect for the course he rsued during this trial, we confess we have always been ungallant as to think that the innocence of Mrs. Forrest some of the principal offences laid to her charge, is not ry clear.

Of the members of the New York bar who commenced eir professional career about the same time as Mr. O'Conor, ere are but few who now survive. The most distinguished the former are, Thomas Addis Emmet, (died in 1827,) avid B. Ogden, (dead ten or twelve years,) George Wood, ead two or three years,) Edward Sanford, (lost in the Arctic, 54,) Francis B. Cutting, (retired from the profession,) gden Hoffman, (dead six or eight years,) Benjamin F. Butr, (dead a few years,) William C. Noyes, (died recently.) short, so far as we are aware, or have been able to learn, ly two survive, namely, James W. Girard and Daniel rd. Both these gentlemen still practise and are the senrs of Mr. O'Conor.

The leading members of the New York bar, at the presit day, who are not considered "old," are James T. Brady, m. M. Evarts, Edwards Pierrepont, Richard O'Gorman, uis B. Woodruff, George Ticknor Curtis, (late of Boston,) hn E. Burrill, John McKeon, J. B. Robinson, ("Richelieu.") me two or three of these are distinguished in the profession representative men; and as such we may take occasion fore long to examine their pretensions to a niche in that mple whose deities are Demosthenes, Cicero, and Blackone; meantime the only one we feel justified in enshrining Charles O'Conor.

Our readers will bear us testimony that there are none more ary of the use of the term genius than we. The reason that we think there are extremely few in any age who ssess that noblest of divine gifts; probably not more than dozen among the whole human family. Yet we are conced that Charles O'Conor possesses that high order of nius whose province it is to *persuade* even against the will. is oratory is, indeed, not of the ornate style; he is not nd of tropes or figures; he never uses expressions of any

kind merely because they are beautiful. On examining any of his speeches it is found that what seems most careless in the delivery or construction, has a direct, logical bearing on the proposition which he means to establish.

Another faculty rarely possessed, even by the most gifted, and which is highly characteristic of O'Conor, is that of exercising an almost equal influence on the most illiterate and most learned. If this be not eloquence we do not understand what the term means, nor do we know in what form to seek,

"The power of thought, the magic of the mind."

But according to the greatest masters it *is* eloquence. O'Conor is not only eloquent in addressing judge and jury; in dealing with witnesses he is wonderfully sagacious, adroit, and successful. Unlike the great majority of the lawyers of the present day—who for the credit of the profession would do well to imitate his example in that particular—he avoids all harshness, even in cross-examination. Because he has thoroughly studied the subject, and understands human nature, his course is rather to conciliate even the adverse witness whom he knows to have entered the court with the lie in his mouth. It has been our privilege to be present at the pleadings of some of the most eminent advocates and jurists of Europe, as well as America; many a time have we heard Lord Denman and Sir Edward Sugden, as well as Napier, O'Connell, Whiteside, Shiel, and O'Hagen—men who may be said to represent every style of forensic eloquence and forensic skill; and we do not hesitate to say that there is not one of the courts in which we have heard them plead, or speak, from the Record Court and Queen's Bench to the bar of the House of Lords, in which the subject of this paper would not be considered an advocate of the first rank.

ART. V.—*Essays on the Administrations of Great Britain, from* 1783 *to* 1830. Contributed to the Edinburgh Review. By the Right Hon. Sir GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart. London, 1864.

WE cannot transcribe the name of this work without a word concerning its lamented author. Sir George Cornewall Lewis had reached middle life before he entered Parliament. He was approaching fifty when he first held high office. Already he had gained an enviable reputation as an admirable scholar, a sound critic, and a judicious commen-

itor upon history and political science. If in parliament e had only maintained his reputation and been content ith it, he would have achieved sufficient honor for one an. But he was not content to do so. In the eight years at elapsed between his re-entrance into the House of Comons in 1855 and his death in 1863, he rose from a humle political position to the first rank of English statesmen, nd was regarded by a large section of the liberals as the ost proper successor of their present veteran leader. But n untimely death again put an end to the confident hopes nd expectations of his friends and countrymen, and like Sir Villiam Molesworth, Lord Herbert, Lord Dalhousie, Lord anning, Lord Elgin, the Duke of Newcastle, and Mr. Cobden—all lost within the last ten years, not to mention more han one veteran statesman retired from public life—he was aken away before old age and in the full vigor of his faculies. Sir George Lewis was distinguished by another fact; e and Mr. Walpole are the two most prominent of what, ince the Reform Bill, has been a growing class of public en; of those who have not received the early training n ce considered essential to success in high office. Perhaps, o, he may be regarded as the most eminent of the statesen who have joined high literary distinction to equal polical services.

These essays were not published in their present form ntil after their author's death, and consequently did not eceive that final revision which he would probably have estowed upon them before publication. They were conributed to the *Edinburgh Review* in part while Sir George, aving been relieved from attendance on parliament by his onstituents failing to re-elect him, filled the position of its ditor. They were evidently written by a busy man, who ad no time to elaborate them into brilliant monographs. heir style is as graceless and unattractive as a congressnal or parliamentary report. Initials and abbreviations re often used. Those who expected in this book anything esembling Macaulay's essays on Horace Walpole's letters nd on Lord Chatham, in many respects a similar series, ust have been greatly disappointed. Nevertheless, few aults can be found with it; the essays are what their writer ntended them to be—a calm, perspicuous and faithful reiew of those political changes to which the Buckingh am apers had drawn attention. No man could be found more ompetent than Sir George Lewis to pass judgment on the

events and men of these times, and for this reason the essay must always be highly valued.

It is singular how much, in studying English history, w have to rely upon books similar to this, and indeed how de fective English literature is in standard works on the histor of England. Hume's history, although published withou the aid of the sources of information now accessible, has, aft the lapse of a century, no rival. This great work, eve when corrected by reading those of Mr. Hallam in conne tion with it, gives a very superficial account of the times o our ancestors. It has sometimes surprised us that none o our American historical scholars have paid attention to th times of the Plantagenets. As the history of our own race should be attractive, but independently of ethnological rea sons few historical subjects are more fascinating than th lives of the Edwards and Henries—than the story of Cressy Poictiers and Agincourt, and the more melancholy one of do mestic wars, and the conflicts of York and Lancaster. Ye far more faithful pictures of the exploits of Plantagenets an Tudors are to be found in the pages of the dramatist an novelist than in those of Hume or Lingard, or any other hi torian, not excepting paradoxical Mr. Froude. With th seventeenth century we are well acquainted; no other ca boast so many and so able illustrators. But the reign o Anne, so long boasted as the Augustan age of England, whic would seem most likely to be a favorite subject with histori rians, still wants a single good one. Two eminent author have barely missed it. Lord Macaulay's incomparable work of which we may say, as Sir Walter Scott did of Christabel that, like the Torso, it defies the ability of man to complet it, and in its fragmentary state will excite feelings of admira tion and despair in our posterity, ceases just as it is enter ing upon the career of the great queen. Lord Stanhope's history begins two years before her death.

It is this fragmentary condition of English history that makes the critical essays of such writers as Sir George Lewis so valuable. To write the entire history of England is a task of too great magnitude and requiring too versatile pow ers for us ever to expect to see it done by one man. Not that it can well be divided into parts; the history of no na tion forms so complete and connected a tale. Brilliant as may be made the story of any part of it, that part will lose much of its value and interest when separated from what preceded and succeeded it. Isolated by nature, language,

and manners, of the English people it can be said with especial truth that they have grown; and every portion of that growth is so intimately connected with the rest that the most skilful selection and treatment cannot prevent its being greatly injured by any separation.

Macaulay attempted to remedy this difficulty by his two brilliant introductory chapters; and then to trace the history of his country down to a time "within the memory of men now living." Long after he had given up all hopes of doing this, he did not despair of connecting it with the work of Lord Stanhope. He has made, however, the history of the revolution as familiar as a novel among a much larger class than usually interests itself in such subjects, and has settled the place in public opinion of a large number of characters. Especially is this true of James the Second, who, though in truth the most odious monarch that ever filled the English throne, has found a crowd of defenders. The halo of romance which the genius of Scott has thrown around the Stuarts and their adherents, the natural partiality which Englishmen would feel for the last line of truly English monarchs, and the many unfavorable comparisons which may be drawn between national manners and national feelings of these, and the unwise obstinacy with which their successors still insist upon clinging to German customs, German sympathies and German alliances, had combined with their misfortunes to foster a morbid partiality to James. To all such feelings Macaulay has given the death-blow. The James of history will now be James as he has painted him, and every effort on the part of writers of the school of Miss Strickland and Mr. Mark Napier to stay the tide which for fifteen years has been steadily setting in against him, will be as useless as the labors of Mrs. Partington.

Lord Macaulay also attempted to settle the position in history of William the Third, but in this he has been less successful. Although we speak with diffidence, we cannot join him and many others in their earnest admiration of that monarch. Had Macaulay been less truthful, he might have drawn from his imagination a most admirable character; but in his narrative he adhered closely to history, and therefore all his ingenious excuses and powers of advocacy fail to conceal the many repulsive features of the real portrait. Great as William was in many respects; eminent as were his services to England, there is little in his character beyond his simple ability to admire or respect, and still less to love or revere.

The selfishness of his motives destroys the illusion of most brilliant achievements, and makes his plots against uncle and father-in-law and his manœuvres to obtain the E lish throne—actions which only the most exalted charac could fully justify—no more creditable to him than thos any other man who has not allowed the most sacred fan ties to stand in the way of his ambition. Yet Macau has been so truthful as to William that we should not beyond his pages to substantiate our own opinion.

The judicial calmness of Sir George Lewis emine fitted him for historical criticism, and although inferio Macaulay in comprehension, in knowledge, and, above in those gifts as a writer in which the latter has no equal, was never a partisan, and his inferiority as a word-pain made him safer in his judgments. Macaulay always appea in the court of history as counsel, sometimes as the un lenting prosecutor, exposing without favor or mercy wickedness of James or Marlborough or Barrere, tearing atoms the flimsy sophistries of weak defences; sometim more gently assisting it in coming to a just conclusion the characters of Machiavelli or Clive or Hastings; and of in warm and earnest defence of Cromwell or William; judicial qualities are for the most part wanting, and we f that had he possessed them he would have been a far less fa nating writer. These qualities particularly distinguish Hallam; they belonged also to Sir George Lewis, and regret that he did not use them in a more extended exa nation of English history than any he has left behind h After this rather wandering introduction, we shall give readers some thoughts of our own in regard to the Engl statesmanship of the present century, and not attempt follow Sir George Lewis in a chronological analysis of administrations he discusses.

Should the members of our cabinet ever have seats gi them in congress, as was proposed at the last session, and a advocated by Mr. Pendleton, General Garfield, and other the House of Representatives, the interest attaching to parliamentary statesmanship of England would be grea enhanced to American readers. As it is, our statesman bears a closer resemblance to that of Great Britain than any other; for although the last republican governm of France was expressly modelled from our Constitution, difference in race, temperament and position prevented practical operation from bearing a similar resemblance.

the liberal constitutions of continental Europe resemble that of England in giving the members of the executive government seats in the legislative body, and in establishing some degree of ministerial responsibility to the legislature. In order to establish this in the United States, there must be great changes in the Constitution, much greater than, even if they would be wise, there is any present prospect of of the people's desiring or permitting. How far Congress, now that it has annually to devise the ways and means for an enormous revenue, can do without the assistance of the Secretary of the Treasury in the House of Representatives remains to be seen. But if this minister should have a seat there, and should propound his own budget, its rejection would embarrass the administration more than declining to comply with the recommendations of his annual report. It is in this view that a careful examination of all the European systems of government will probably become necessary in order to discover whether our own may not be rendered more efficient in the relations between the executive and legislative departments.

From the death of Queen Anne to the accession of George the Third, the whig aristocracy, supported by the great body of the people, monopolized the government of England. The first two monarchs of the house of Hanover naturally looked upon the tories as hostile to their dynasty. The nation at large, convinced that their religion and liberties would be unsafe under the Stuarts, distrusted them for the same reason. The tories therefore, although thoroughly supported by the country gentry, the University of Oxford, and the inferior clergy, were in as hopeless a minority as the whigs were a few generations after. But they were powerful enough to give at times no small annoyance to the government. Their exclusion and opposition became less general after the fall of Sir Robert Walpole. But it was not until after George the Second's death and the rise of Lord Bute to power, that they were admitted to a real share in the government of the country. The new king strongly favored them; they in turn abandoned the Stuarts. A large part of the upper classes, caring more about enjoying the sunshine of royal favor than for abstract principles, passed over to them; while the people, no longer fearing the Stuarts and tired of the whigs, either inclined to the tories or were indifferent. Lord North's was, to all intents and purposes, a tory administration; and after the overthrow of the whigs in

1784, the tories enjoyed the entire monopoly of the government until 1830, except during the few months in 1806-7, when Lord Grenville's whig government was in power. Thus between 1715 and the passage of the Reform Bill the two great parties had about an equal share in the government.

The Reform Bill has again changed this balance. Since its passage there have been eight general elections and eight parliaments. In only one of these have the conservatives obtained a majority of the House of Commons, namely, in 1841, when they had the aid of all who were interested in the maintenance of agricultural protection. In the thirty-five years which have elapsed since 1830, the liberals have been in power twenty-eight years. The conclusion, we think, is natural and necessary, that under a constitution as liberal as Great Britain now is, a conservative party must expect to spend most of its life in opposition. Such was the fate of the American whig party. The conservatives themselves account for it by ascribing it to Sir Robert Peel's desertion of protection in 1846, but they are very much in error. Had Sir Robert Peel adhered to protection, and had the country been subjected to two more years of the agitation of Anti-Corn-Law League, the election of 1847 would have almost annihilated him and his party. Viewed simply as a matter of party tactics, his course displayed admirable wisdom, as it took the wind entirely out of the sails of the opposition. The tactics were spoilt by the obtuseness of Lord Derby (then Lord Stanley) and his followers, who could not, or would not, perceive that it had become a war between them and the people, and that they must yield. If the conservatives had submitted to free trade it is possible that they might have again gained a majority in the election of 1847. But Lord Aberdeen's foreign policy would have been pretty sure to shipwreck them before another parliament. We think the conservatives are likely to succeed at the coming general election, but if they do it will be owing to a variety of causes, which will prevent the constituencies from returning that liberal majority which, as now organized, they will return four times out of five.

Although it has sometimes been contended that there is nothing in common, except the name, between the great political parties of the present century and their predecessors in the time of Walpole, we think they have maintained most of their distinguishing characteristics. Any differences which there may be are easily ascribable to change in time

and situation and in the questions of the day. The hostility of the tories to the first and second Georges caused them often to be democratic in their language, and the whigs, like all parties, are very different in opposition from what they are in office. Yet the whigs were the progressive party in Walpole's time as they are to-day, and the tories then, as they have ever since, opposed change in the institutions of the country. The only exception is the Septennial Act, and that was more a question of passion than of principle. When it began to mean something more, the tories became its warmest supporters. The tories have always been supporters of the royal prerogative, but their attachment to it began when the sovereign was almost certain to prefer them to the whigs, and it has been found to mean little when they were out of favor with the court. Their conduct in 1839 proves this; the conservatives found to their horror that the queen was a whig, and no whig ever opposed the prerogative more vigorously than they did then. It will be remembered that her Majesty refused to part with the ladies of her court, (who were mostly relatives of whig noblemen,) at the time when the ministry was to be changed. The whigs inconsistently supported her. Upon their past theories the queen's conduct was indefensible; according to all tory maxims, she had merely exerted a very just prerogative. Never, however, was either George the Third or George the Fourth subjected to one-half the violent abuse from the most factious whigs that Queen Victoria had to bear from a portion of the conservative party. We say nothing of the wisdom of the queen's course; the whigs were undoubtedly selfish in placing her in such a position. But the conservatives flung to the winds all their boasted disinterested loyalty in insisting upon the terms which they did, and in the bitterness towards her Majesty which many of them afterwards displayed.

Some of the conservative speakers used the vilest language towards their sovereign, whose sex, as well as her station, should have protected her from attack. One of the worst instances was a speech of a clergyman, which Mr. O'Connell read to the House of Commons. Mr. Disraeli, in his novel of "Sibyl," strongly dissents from Sir Robert Peel's decision on this occasion. It may be questioned, however, whether the queen's course was his real reason for not accepting office.

Twice have conservative ministries carried vital meas-

ures of reform in the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities and in the abolition of the corn laws. But this was owing to the agitation for these measures having culminated while they were in power, when the ministers perceived that opposition was no longer possible; and with the assistance of their opponents carried these reforms against their usual supporters. We think it is not unlikely that the conservatives will again be forced to adopt a similar course. A conservative ministry indeed creates agitation. So well is this understood in England that many extreme radicals think more can be obtained from a conservative than from a liberal government. The responsibilities of office open eyes that in opposition are sure to be shut to the most convincing of arguments—necessity. Certain, therefore, as the conservatives are of the support of the opposition on such occasions, the majority which they possess in the House of Lords enables them to carry measures which liberals could only do by using intimidation in order to force the peers to assent to them.

It is, however, the boast, and justly so, of the conservative party that they pay far less regard to birth and station in selecting their leaders than do the whigs. It has been asserted, also, that the tory aristocracy are less haughty and less exclusive than their liberal brethren, and ingenious reasons have been given for the fact. However this may be, the other assertion, notwithstanding the strenuous denial of whig statesmen, is placed beyond question by an examination of the history of the two parties.* Mr. Pitt and Mr. Percival were the younger sons of earls. But we question whether the whigs would not have been shocked at the idea of placing either of them at the head of a whig ministry instead of some Rockingham or Portland. Mr. Addington had no claim to family at all. Since then, among the prominent leaders of all ranks of the conservative party, have been Mr. Canning, Mr. Vansittart, Mr. Huskisson, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Herries, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Disraeli, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Walpole and Mr. Sotheron Estcourt. Two of these were prime ministers, three leaders of the House of Commons, and all of them secretaries of state or chancellors of the exchequer.

The whigs can show no such record. To go back to Sir

* Somewhere in Moore's Diary and Correspondence there is a conversation between himself and the late Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord Russell, in which he asserts, and they deny, the justice of the statement in the text.

Robert Walpole, he was for a long time kept in a humble position, and upon his return to office, after the bursting of the South Sea bubble, it is doubtful whether his noble colleagues intended him to be much higher than Craggs and Aislabie had been, until they found in him a master. From his time until the rise of Pitt, the ministers were almost all members of the aristocracy. The elder Pitt's life is one long history of aristocratic jealousy and exclusion. George Grenville was the son of a peeress and brother of a peer. Charles Fox was a peer's son and a grandson of a Duke of Richmond; and even he never attained the position of prime minister. The story of Mr. Burke is well known. Mr. Brougham was hardly more than tolerated by the whigs until he became lord chancellor. Mr. Charles Grant, like Mr. Gladstone, came full grown from the tories. Sir Charles Wood and Sir Francis Baring married into the Greys, and the English people have generally considered this their principal claim to office. Mr. Labouchere married a lady of the Howard family. Sir George Lewis deserved everything he ever attained, but we fear that what attracted attention to him for the chancellorship of the Exchequer in 1855 was as much his being brother-in-law of the Earl of Clarendon as his great merit. Mr. Cardwell first rose to importance as a Peelite, and owed his promotion to the terms of the coalition between the Peelites and whigs. Excepting him, the only ministers we now remember to compare with the conservative list are Mr. Windham, Sir James Graham, Mr. Spring Rice, and Sir William Molesworth—all of very high rank among the gentry. None of them ever led the House of Commons. The whigs have had no prime minister since Sir Robert Walpole, or leader of the House of Commons since the first William Pitt, who has not been a peer or son of a peer; and since Mr. Grenville's resignation, a century ago, all their prime ministers have been "lords." Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Poulett Thomson, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Charles Buller, Mr. Milner Gibson, and many others whom we might enumerate, however serviceable and distinguished they may have been, were early taught that the highest offices belonged to the great families and their connections. At least they never attained them. It looks now as if the liberals could not escape from Mr. Gladstone, at least as their leader in the House of Commons. But eminent as he is, we shall be very much surprised if they do not attempt to confine him to this, and to make him yield the premiership to Lord Clarendon

or Lord Grenville—a pupilage to which we trust he will never consent.

Since the disappearance of Pitt and Fox from the scene, the five most prominent statesmen of England have been Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Canning, Sir Robert Peel, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston. Castlereagh may be considered as representing the policy which ended in the overthrow of Napoleon; Canning the policy which separated Great Britain from the Holy Alliance, and began to carry liberalism into foreign affairs; Peel the present financial system; Russell, the author of the Reform Bill, the reform era; and Palmerston the present period of domestic repose, and the policy which has encouraged constitutionalism on the Continent. Three others have attained almost equal prominence—Lords Grenville, Grey, and Derby; but they have not exerted equal influence with the five, or engrossed so large a share of public attention. Lord Liverpool was not much more than the presiding officer of his cabinet; and the fame of the Duke of Wellington, Lord Brougham, and Lord Lyndhurst, is, after all, principally professional.

Castlereagh, whose misfortune it has been to be the most unpopular of all, and to be generally depreciated, was a man of higher character, and more worthy of public regard, than has been generally acknowledged. If in pure intellectual qualities his rank is not high, his moral qualities fully justify the great place he filled in England and Europe. He possessed excellent common sense, dauntless courage, great firmness, great industry, and great tenacity of purpose. The real secret, however, of his success, we think, lies in this fact: that his views displayed remarkable agreement and sympathy with the opinions and feelings of the English people on the absorbing topic of the day, the war with France. It is immaterial whether or not that war was a necessary one on the part of England; there can be no doubt that the great body of the people regarded it as a life-and-death struggle; that success was essential not only to their maritime supremacy, but to their national existence; and Castlereagh fully shared these opinions. An abler man might have wavered; he might have been appalled at the terrible cost and burden which the war entailed; his mind, more comprehensive, would have foreseen the evils sure to follow upon success. Castlereagh had no such fear; he never for a moment wavered; his narrow mind, excluding everything else, saw nothing but the danger from the ascen-

dency of France. Such narrow-mindedness is at times no inconsiderable power. It shuts out from view consequences which would make a statesman of broad views hesitate, and thus renders any particular policy upon which its possessor is bent more distinct, more positive, and more determined, while it keeps a minister in accord with public opinion, which generally dwells upon only one thing at a time. In these ways it was of the greatest service to Lord Castlereagh. He represented the English people, not because he was particularly skilled in fathoming their feelings, but because he felt with them; and they perceived this sufficiently to repose confidence in him and to support him. The success which crowned his policy was the beginning of his difficulties. As he had succeeded where a greater man might have failed, so now he failed from want of those higher intellectual qualities which before might have injured him. His mind was warped by the great struggle in which he had been engaged, and his fears of France sadly trammelled him at Vienna, and too often made England the tool of the Holy Alliance. He was by no means illiberal in domestic matters. It is now well known that, so far from being responsible for the enormities committed in Ireland during the rebellion, he did all that the could to stay the violence of the dominant party. He supported the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and doubtless, had it become necessary, would have cheerfully introduced a reform bill. For the severities of the administration after the peace, Lord Sidmouth and Lord Eldon were responsible. The gravest charge that can be brought against Castlereagh respecting them is that of indifference. The last years of his life must have been anything but happy; at home, public distress and public discontent were rampant; abroad, his policy had involved him in inextricable difficulties, and he found his hands tied when at length his eyes were opened to the selfishness, faithlessness, and dangerous policy of the allied sovereigns, whom he had done so much to strengthen. The fact, too, that he was looked upon by the populace as an odious tyrant, responsible for the sins of the whole cabinet, and for the public distress, must have greatly preyed upon his spirits. Had he lived, his policy must have been substantially the same as Mr. Canning's; but anxiety and disappointment meanwhile overthrew his strong mind, and led to a tragical termination of his career, at the height of his unpopularity, and when his failures were most apparent.

Very different was the fate of Mr. Canning. His political opinions may not have been very different from Lord Castlereagh's, but his generous nature and splendid genius prevented his falling into the other's blunders. This eminent man, the greatest statesman that Great Britain has possessed in the present century, was saved by the death of his rival from closing his life as an Indian satrap. For many years he had been overshadowed by smaller men, and now began the career which he ought to have entered upon many years before. He broke loose from the Holy Alliance, protested against the invasion of Spain, and placed Great Britain at the head of those liberal ideas which it had hoped finally to crush out in the two southern peninsulas. Mr. Canning also instilled a new and far different life into the old tory cabinet. He was too discerning to believe that the repressive system of the previous thirty years could, with safety, be followed longer; too kind-hearted not to loathe oppression and injustice; and, fortunately, too poor and too disconnected with the aristocracy to have any personal interest in the maintenance of abuses. He was undoubtedly a conservative, but his conservatism bore as little affinity to that of Lords Eldon and Sidmouth as theirs did to Lord Burghley's. Had he been in power in 1831, we firmly believe he would have been a reformer. Such was the opinion of Lord Palmerston, who probably knew more of Mr. Canning's private opinions than any other man. He was too shrewd and discerning to have made the Duke of Wellington's foolish and uncalled-for declaration against change in the representative system; he was too broadly national and too exalted in his views of public duty to allow himself in an awful crisis to be trammelled by past pledges and opinions, or by any absurd ideas of allegiance to party. Few will now deny that in 1831 the choice was limited between reform and revolution. The Duke of Wellington (who, Mr. Disraeli says, never understood the English people) did not see it; Lord Lyndhurst did not want to see it, but we believe Sir Robert Peel's mind was opening to this fact, although he trembled at it; and Mr. Canning would have perceived it at once. So would Sir Robert Walpole, or either of the Pitts.

The whigs have instanced Canning's unpopularity with his own party as a proof that the tories are as exclusive as themselves in their choice of leaders. But we think his unpopularity cannot justly be ascribed to this, although his

nemies among the tories may have sometimes alluded to
. Mr. Canning's family was quite as good as the Duke of
Vellington's or Lord Castlereagh's, and much better than
[r. Addington's or Sir Robert Peel's. Those whig Brah-
ins who assailed him so unjustly in 1827 were probably
ie men who felt most keenly the degradation of permitting
ie son of an actress to become prime minister. Mr. Can-
ing was not a man to be very popular beyond the circle
f his friends. His brilliant oratory was less fitted for the
ucolic comprehensions of country squires than the ungram-
atical, clumsy, but intelligible common sense of Lord Cas-
ereagh; and he probably displayed his contempt for their
onest stupidity at times in a most unwise manner.

His too frequent pleasantry offended the grave, his sar-
asm wounded the sensitive, and his broad liberal principles
f statesmanship alarmed all who were afraid of change.
either did the whigs do him justice. They could not un-
erstand how such a man could remain in the tory ranks—
a anomaly that seriously threatened their monoply of lib-
alism and sound principles of government. But their most
rievous complaint against him was his acceptance of office
1 1807. The king dismissed the whig ministry because they
ould not give certain pledges regarding the Roman Cath-
ic disabilities. Mr. Canning, although he was strongly
pposed to these disabilities, joined the succeeding cabinet,
r doing which he was charged with deserting his princi-
es for office. But we think the charge most unjust. Con-
dering the unsound mind of George the Third, it might
ell be doubted whether it was wise to press upon him the
ubject that had already once driven him mad, instead of post-
oning it till after his death. It was sure to cause a quar-
l, in which he was almost equally sure to be supported by
ie country. Such, we take it, was Mr. Pitt's opinion, and
ich the opinion of Mr. Fox, who had determined to postpone
ie question. So also thought Mr. Canning. Lord Grenville
nd Lord Grey thought otherwise, and beautiful work they
ade of it in attempting to put their opinions in practice.
hose who have attacked Mr. Canning for this overlook the
ct that upon every other question he differed widely from
ie whigs, and probably thought their general policy most
rnicious; and his subsequent differences with his colleagues
elated solely to matters of administration. There is no
roof that Mr. Canning ever compromised his opinions re-
arding religious disabilities. To these he sacrificed popu-

larity with the larger part of his countrymen, and many years of supreme official power. He never attempted the military method of removing them, so successfully tried by the Duke of Wellington in 1829; but to have attempted that would have been as rash for him as to have taken command of the allied armies at Waterloo.

Far inferior as he was to Mr. Canning, Lord Grenville filled nearly as large a place in the eyes of his countrymen. He came from an official family, which for fifty years had formed almost a party by itself; his father was the prime minister of stamp act notoriety; his maternal grandfather was Sir William Wyndham, the justly celebrated tory leader. He was cousin to Mr. Pitt, and almost every one of his relatives held high office. He too was a man of unquestionable ability, of eminent accomplishments, and of great parliamentary and official experience. He rose rapidly in Mr. Pitt's first administration, until he became the second person in it. In political opinions he undoubtedly more nearly agreed with Mr. Pitt than with any one else. He agreed with him on the engrossing subject of the French war; he never showed that he held the whig views regarding parliamentary reform. His famous protest against the corn-laws does not contain a word in which Mr. Pitt could not have coincided. All this makes his separation from the latter in 1804 most difficult to explain on any high ground. Both wished Mr. Fox to be a member of the ministry; the king would not agree to it, and Mr. Pitt did not press it further. Lord Grenville thereupon separated from his benefactor and joined the whigs, as did all the powerful Grenville connection.

This conduct admits of but one satisfactory explanation. Lord Grenville already aspired to the premiership. He could not forget that he was a Grenville, and therefore entitled to it; and he hoped, that had Mr. Fox joined the ministry, the personal rivalry between him and Pitt would oblige the latter to give up his claim to the office of prime minister. That he expected the premiership would fall to himself or to his brother is now well known. Disappointed in this, the Grenvilles joined the whigs, and Lord Grenville enjoyed the object of his ambition for a few months. During the tottering administration of the Duke of Portland and Mr. Percival, while it was expected that the crown or the regency would soon devolve upon the Prince of Wales, who had heretofore been a vehement whig, the Grenvilles remained true to their whig allies. When, however, Lord Liverpool's ministry be-

came firmly seated in power, when the unexpected hostility of the prince deprived the whigs of all hopes of office during his life as well as his father's, the Grenvilles gradually separated from them, and finally, after a good deal of quarrelling about their price, again joined the tories. Their course throughout was cordially approved by the leader. For these reasons we think Lord Grenville is open to the charges of inordinate ambition and gross ingratitude in his conduct in 1804. As a statesman, he proved an efficient lieutenant, but we think he signally failed as a commander.

Lord Grey figures too prominently in these essays to allow us to omit mention of him, but his name is so exalted that it is with diffidence we attempt a word of comment. His parliamentary talents have been seldom equalled, and he joined to them a lofty personal character and undoubted ability as a statesman. It was his fate to spend his entire life in opposition, excepting a year of office in Lord Grenville's government, and four years in his own. For a man of brilliant parts, who has determined to devote his life to politics, to join a party in an almost hopeless minority, and to cling to its principles through more than forty years of adversity, withstanding innumerable temptations to compromise with his opponents so far as to obtain an opportunity of serving his country in office, requires political integrity of a rare order, and deserving of earnest admiration. All this Lord Grey did. His voice was constantly and persistently raised against arbitrary government, and oppressive measures, when it required great nerve to open one's mouth at all against the government, when a liberal was regarded as little better than a traitor, and was even shunned in private life. Lord Grey has had his reward in the reverence still felt for his memory, and in his name having become synonymous with stainless purity of character and love of freedom.

It may seem invidious to speak of his faults, but it is necessary to an understanding of his career. He certainly was not always wise in opposition; as a minister his failings are still more glaring. We think, as we have before mentioned, that Lord Grenville and he were unwise in quarrelling with the king in 1807. The negotiations of 1812 are still more damaging to their reputations. But the great trial of Lord Grey's statesmanship came in 1832. His ministry had carried the Reform Bill, in doing which it had displayed no little resolution, but otherwise the task had required and called forth no very remarkable qualities. When this had

been accomplished, nothing could exceed the hesitation shown by the premier. His financial policy was a failure, his cabinet was torn by dissension, and notwithstanding his large majority it was broken up in little more than a year. He had a difficult task before him, but not more difficult than many others have had; not more so than Mr. Pitt's, in 1784, or Sir Robert Peel's, in 1835. There have been weak prime ministers in the present century: the Duke of Portland, Lord Goderich, Lord Melbourne, Lord Aberdeen; but Lord Goderich is the only one who has made so signal a failure as Earl Grey. This may in part be accounted for by his limited official experience. A life of opposition is not a good preparation for administration. But we are even then at a loss to discover evidence of the eminent statesmanship claimed for Lord Grey by his whig admirers.

Nor was Lord Grey without the faults of the whig aristocracy. He was proud, haughty and exclusive. His attack upon Mr. Canning, in 1827, was so ungenerous, so cold and so bitter, that it will always be regarded as a serious blemish on his character—one that has never been satisfactorily explained, if it does not prove that he was incapable of high magnanimity and generous sympathy. We fear jealousy had some share in it. Lord Grey's intense whig and aristocratic feelings became very apparent in office. He confined himself, as far as he could, in appointments to the pure whig blood; and disliked even his able Canningite allies. His nepotism, too, was the cause of much scandal. He provided well for himself and his family. His year of office in 1806 was sufficient to turn the family barony into an earldom. He had not become fairly seated in the premiership before he conferred upon himself the ribbon of the garter, without waiting for a vacancy in the order. His intimate relatives warmed in the ministry. His brother was made a bishop, and he showered honors, lucrative offices, and military and naval appointments upon sons, cousins, and other relations. The English had been accustomed to something of the kind under the tory rule, but were disgusted at the rapacity of a minister whose motto was "Peace, retrenchment, and reform," but who, in this fault, surpassed his predecessors.

The limits of a review article will not allow us to enlarge upon the later statesmen of England, and perhaps it would be well to omit them altogether. Sir Robert Peel and Lord John (now Earl) Russell were so many years the rival leaders

of the House of Commons, that we shall speak of them together. Sir Robert Peel was the more successful minister, but he had requisites for success which Lord Russell never possessed, strong majorities both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. The loss the liberals have never possessed in the present century, and to this is to be ascribed in a great measure their ill success in legislation. The conservatives, too, are a much more homogeneous party than the liberals, and generally more docile and obedient. Thus Sir Robert Peel was enabled to begin and complete a systematic series of legislative measures, which he and his friends would have mercilessly mutilated had a whig ministry proposed them. But Sir Robert Peel's administrative abilities were of a far higher order than his rival's; as a statesman he was more sagacious and more resolute, and more regardless of minor consequences. Convinced of the necessity of removing the Roman Catholic disabilities and repealing the corn laws, he considered party obligations of trivial importance, even if a violation of them should banish him from office. We doubt very much whether Lord Russell would have cared as little for the fate of the whig party. The conservatives are very exacting in their demands upon their leaders, and from recent articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* and the *Quarterly Review* we infer that they still consider Sir Robert Peel as guilty of party treason, and that he should have been true to them notwithstanding the consequences to the country. The fault was on their side, not upon his. The result of his adhering to protectionist opinons or resigning office in 1846, and allowing the whigs to dissolve parliament, would have been infinitely more disastrous to the conservative party than the course he took. The whig protectionists generally treated their leaders in a much better manner.

Sir Robert Peel was eminently successful in choosing his colleagues. No English premier ever showed equal discernment in this respect, where his own origin probably assisted him. He always pushed forward young and promising men to the front rank. The world has long admired the abilities of that little knot of statesmen known as Peelites, but equal wisdom would have discovered equally good material among the liberals. Lord Derby deserves praise for discrimination of the same kind. Nothing could have been more unpromising than the material from which he had to form his cabinet in 1852, but his selections, made without regard to

family or connections, were generally fortunate, and, except Lord Malmesbury, received, after trial, the public approval.

Here was Lord John Russell's great failing. The cabinet he formed in 1846 was eminently the family government, consisting of gentleman-like politicians, with good pedigrees, genteel connections, large estates, and some official experience. Men were allowed to become radicals, and vex the ministry with agitation of all kinds, who, if place had been found for them, would have made excellent ministers. So Sir William Molesworth proved to be some years later. We do not believe Sir Robert Peel would have allowed Mr. Cobden to run wild. Lord John Russell's cabinet was so formed that, in consequence of it, he began his administration with a large amount of unpopularity. His chancellor of the exchequer's incapacity became almost as notorious as Sir Francis Dashwood's. Lord Palmerston in the Foreign office and Lord Clarendon as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland were the redeeming features of the government, but the Greys strongly protested against the former appointment. Macaulay, like Burke, was thrust into the pay office, although he had a seat in the cabinet; a convenient out-of-the-way place was found for Mr. Butler, while Sir Charles Wood and Sir George Grey were adorning the better offices. Lord John Russell's fault in this respect still clings to him. He is personally disinterested, and undoubtedly honest, but a training among the old whig aristocracy was the worst a politician could receive, and such was his, and his mind has been exceedingly narrowed in consequence. Within two years, amid the murmurs of the nation, he recalled Sir James Hudson, the distinguished English minister at Turin, to make way for his brother-in-law. A conservative would not have been guilty of such a blunder.

Lord Russell's parliamentary talents are of a very high order; nearly, if not quite, equal to Sir Robert Peel's. As a debater he has had few equals, and has fully justified the Duke of Wellington's assertion that he was a host in himself. His great successes have therefore been in parliament, and there he has generally been greatest in opposition. Personally he is fearless enough to satisfy Sidney Smith's famous saying, but as a minister he is too hesitating and timid. The great blunder of his life was dismissing Lord Palmerston from the foreign office in 1851, to please the prejudices of the court. He turned the latter into a rival, who speedily supplanted him in the leadership of the liberal party, and has retained it

ever since. Indeed, the foreign policy of Lord John Russell's government proved its strongest point, as it was the weak point of Sir Robert Peel's.

It is interesting to speculate upon what might have been the destiny of the Earl of Derby had he not (when Lord Stanley) seceded from the whigs in 1834. Had he remained with them it is almost certain that he would have succeeded Lord Althorpe as their leader in the House of Commons, and might eventually have become their prime minister. Although not an abler man, nor more powerfully connected, he got the start of Lord John Russell in early life, and at thirty-four became secretary of state for the colonies, while Russell, who is seven years his senior, was only paymaster of the forces. His advancement he doubtless owed to his precocious powers of debate, which caused Macaulay to say of him that he was the only eminent debater who had not made himself master of his art at the expense of his audience. Whether Lord Derby would have succeeded so well in the liberal party, as he has in the conservative, is very doubtful. Up to 1834, however, he had been looked upon as rather an extreme liberal, and, except on church questions, has not, we believe, displayed his latent toryism. The famous "appropriation question," upon which he separated from his colleagues, was one of those abstract principles which never resulted in anything except in breaking up Lord Grey's government, and which should never have been allowed to be agitated. We think, however, that Lord Derby must eventually have found his way to the conservative ranks. His high birth, brilliant accomplishments and great eloquence have always made him a favorite, but he lacks discretion, both as a debater and a minister, and seems to grow daily more narrow and conservative in his opinions. He takes his exclusion from office with extreme good nature, and we doubt whether he personally cares for it. His position is too exalted to make such honors or emoluments of any particular value to him, and only a sense of duty can induce a man like him to undergo all the fatigues and submit to the drudgery of an opposition leader. Nor can he well lament his opposition life, when it gives him the time to gain more permanent fame by distinguished labors in the field of literature. But his translation of Homer hardly falls within our subject. Lord Derby, although a brilliant politician and a nobleman of high character, has not, we think, with all his ability, earned a very

great reputation as a statesman. No great political measure is associated with his name; no very profound or original principles have been enunciated in his speeches. He lacks, too, those broad sympathies which enable a statesman to judge of the wants and feelings of all classes in the community.

The present veteran prime minister is a far more remarkable man—remarkable for his long political career, extending back to 1807; for his vigorous old age, which enables him in his eighty-first year to preside over his sovereign's councils and lead the House of Commons; and for his rare sagacity, sound judgment, great political knowledge, vast experience, and wide popularity. We believe Cardinal Fleury is the only man who has held a similar office at an equally great age; but Fleury never had Palmerston's parliamentary duties to perform. A very marked comparison may be drawn between Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Walpole. In both are seen the same good humor, the same wonderful knowledge of men, of the House of Commons and of the English people; the same dexterity in debate, the same skill in administration, the same careless indifference to theories, the same long official career, and the same thorough comprehension of the every-day wants of the kingdom. Lord Palmerston excels in his knowledge of diplomatic matters and the foreign relations of the kingdom, as Sir Robert Walpole did in finance. The foundation of the character of each is the sterling common sense which distinguishes the English above other nations. But Lord Palmerston has not the inordinate love of power, which in Sir Robert Walpole drove all his abler colleagues into opposition. It did, indeed, seem as if, in his first ministry, Lord Palmerston was destined for the same unequal warfare, but since then he has shown himself anxious to make his cabinet as strong as he can.

But Lord Palmerston's career is also remarkable for the slow progress made by him in gaining an acknowledged position among English statesmen. Having held an administrative office for a long period under the tories, without taking active part in debate, he was regarded as nothing more than a placeman, indifferent to principles so long as he could retain his salary; and the number of prime ministers under whom he had served was constantly alluded to by opponents in debate and on the hustings. Sir Robert Peel more than once stooped to so unworthy a sneer. We

re not inclined to esteem very highly a certain sort of consistency which some value so much. But, in fact, few statesmen have been more consistent than Lord Palmerston. He egan life as a conservative of the school of Pitt and Canning, and although he held office uninterruptedly from 1807 ntil 1828, yet this was in fact in one continuous tory administration, notwithstanding the constant changes taking lace in the premiership. With the rest of Mr. Canning's iends, he left the Duke of Wellington's government in 828, and two years later joined the whig government of ord Grey, since which time he has been a member of the beral party. In his views of government the change was robably very slight. That many who knew him regarded im, even in his tory days, very differently from the popular stimate of him, is certain. Mr. Canning, whose disciple he as since been considered, was discerning enough to detect is extraordinary powers, and after his secession from the ories they endeavored repeatedly to entice him back.*

The whigs were a long time finding out that he was a onsummate politician. When, on Lord Althorpe's leaving he House of Commons, they were at a loss for a leader, the laims of Lord John Russell, Mr. Spring Rice, and Mr. bercrombie were canvassed by the press, but Lord Palmrston was not once mentioned for the position. When he as defeated for Parliament in 1835, the speaker said of him, Lord Palmerston was useful as a debater sometimes, but ually we think he is as well out of the way. He is the ss likely to form a part of the next liberal ministry." idney Smith spoke in an equally disparaging manner of im. While liberals so regarded the ablest man in their arty, it is not so surprising that conservatives did not appreciate him. This, however, was owing to his confining imself entirely to his duties as foreign secretary, which ien created little interest in the country. When he had to efend his policy in the House of Commons, his powers as a ebater were as conspicuous as they have since been. He as seldom delivered more powerful and convincing speeches an those of 1837 in defence of his course with regard to

* "He quitted a tory government in 1828, because he differed with them pon public principle. While out of office then it had been three several mes proposed to him by that government to return to office. They proosed to him not only to return himself, but to take any two of hispoliti-l friends with him. They offered him one of three seats n the cabinet hrice was the offer made to him, and thrice did he decline it." — *Lord Palmston's Speech to the Electors of Hampshire, January* 12, 1835.

Spain. The brilliant success of his policy in 1840 in Syria which in wisdom and promptitude was worthy of Chatham first attracted general attention to him. But even afterward and when his reputation on the Continent exceeded that of any other Englishman, he hardly held a second rank in his own country.

It is a satisfaction, then, to all who admire ability, that this distinguished minister has lived to gain his present extraordinary ascendency—an ascendency unparalleled since the days of Mr. Pitt. As a diplomatist he has never had an equal in England, and his foreign policy has generally been justified by the results. He was the first English statesman who looked upon the Orleanists as unalterably hostile to England and who probably rejoiced at their fall.* Fortunate, too, was it that the seals of the foreign office had been restored to his vigorous grasp before the great revolutionary outbreak of 1848; and considering the dangers abroad and the difficulties at home, a weak ministry, a hostile court, hesitating and unfriendly colleagues, and bitter critics in parliament, his success was very great. It is not probable that until his dismissal in 1851 he had ever looked forward to any other office than that of foreign secretary. That step paved the way for his advancement to the premiership, where in maintaining himself he has displayed such extraordinary resources.

Lord Palmerston is naturally a very able man. Much as his tact and experience have assisted him, they would have been of comparatively little use without intellectual powers of a high order. His long service in diplomatic matters drew away until recent years his attention from domestic questions, of which his knowledge is still limited, but such as it is it goes a good way. Of legislation he knows as little as did Sir Robert Peel of foreign affairs. One great gift he possesses to a rare degree, and that is the power of inspiring general confidence. This is owing to his broad national feelings. He confines his sympathies to no party or class, but is a thorough Englishman, with his countrymen's virtues and foibles; devotedly attached to his native country, and governed in his policy by his opinions of her interest. Thus he has not inspired any great degree of confidence abroad, much as he is respected and even admired. Clear-sighted rather

* Sir James Graham, in his speech on Lord Palmerston's foreign policy in 1850, charged him with having by his intrigues brought about the revolution of 1848. He evidently thought this a most solemn charge. We do not know how true it may be.

han far-sighted, he deals with present difficulties without oking very far into the future, and it is very seldom that he oes not see his way out of them. His generous efforts to ield his colleagues and subordinates from censure, and the eadiness with which he assumes responsibility for their ctions, add not a little to his popularity. In his kindly na-ure, too, there is very little or no vindictiveness, and he eems to treasure up no bitterness towards men who have ade most violent attacks upon him Without any particular eories or principles of government, he cannot be classed in e highest rank of statesmen. But his many admirable and ell-balanced qualities, his great knowledge and experience, nd his untiring energy place him in a most honorable posi-on in the second rank.

We should have liked to devote a small space to Mr. ladstone and Mr. Disraeli, the lieutenants of the rival par-es, and whom our generation will probably see enrolled mong the English premiers. But we must leave them for nother time.

RT. VI.—*The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: the common English Version corrected.* By the Final Committee of the American Bible Union. New York, American Bible Union, 1865.

AN eminent writer has remarked that translators are sel-om men of genius; they are as jackals in the world of let-ers. An exception should be made in favor of those who ndertake to translate the Bible. We do not mean that all ho have undertaken the work possessed genius or even learn-ng, but that men of the highest order of intellect have devoted emselves for years to the task; and, moreover, that a good ernacular version of the Bible is a work that requires the high-st talent for its execution. Very few, save those who have ied, are aware of the difficulty of making a good translation f any work. It is not sufficient to know the two languages. n American may feel perfectly at home in a good classic nd idiomatic French author, for instance, and yet be unable

to translate a single chapter of it well. Set him down to it, and he seizes upon the first English words and expressions that come into his head, provided they express in English, no matter how awkwardly, the idea so beautifully put in French. In general, the translator does his part best who acts the good interpreter. Not words, but ideas, he has to translate, and he should endeavor so to render these as to transfuse the tone and spirit of the original into his composition. If this were only attended to, we should not see so many books done out of other languages without being put into English.

The case of the Bible, however, is altogether a peculiar one. Here the translator is not allowed to play the interpreter. The liberty of diction permitted in other works is denied in this instance. The book being the word of God, his word we want, not the translator's. Every jot and tittle of the book is deemed of importance, and every jot and tittle of the original we must have in our vernacular, neither more nor less.

Before we proceed to what is more particularly our object in the present article—namely, to make some remarks on certain recent translations, especially on that of the body which styles itself "The Final Committee,"—we will refer briefly to some of the old Bibles which are regarded as standards. There are various editions of the Hebrew Bible, both manuscript and printed, which in many instances differ considerably from each other. It is generally admitted that the best of the former are those copied by the Jews of Spain. The most ancient printed editions of the Hebrew Bible are those published by the Jews of Italy; and it may be justly added that those printed under Jewish supervision are the most accurate. The one esteemed the most correct is that published at Soncinum in 1486, but this only contained the books of the prophets.

Of the Greek versions, the most ancient and probably the most correct is the Septuagint. The second Greek Bible is that of Venice, published in 1518, and known as the Aldine edition. The third in the order of time is that of the Vatican, published at Rome in 1587. An immense amount of labor was bestowed upon this by Cardinal Caraffa and other learned men, who were employed on it for nine years by order, and under the supervision, of Pope Sixtus V. Different editions of this have since been published, each distinguished by peculiar features; but the most celebrated is that pub-

lished at Paris in 1628, and which contains a Latin version annexed to the Greek, together with the Greek Scholia, and the notes and various readings by Nobilius. It is worthy of remark, in passing, that it is from this all our English editions, including that known as "King James's," have been taken.

Of all the Latin versions the Vulgate is undoubtedly the best; but there have been two known by this title, the Ancient and the Modern; the former being sometimes called "the old Italic," to distinguish it from versions made in other countries. The old Vulgate was translated from the Greek Septuagint, for the use of the Latins soon after their conversion to Christianity. St. Jerome, one of the most learned men of his time, was not pleased with it, however, and accordingly he undertook a version of his own, which he completed between 370 and 380. This also is known as the Ancient Vulgate, but it has met the fate of all other editions bearing the same title.

It is true that what is called the Modern Vulgate is abundantly old. The two principal editions of it are those of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. The former pope collected the most ancient manuscripts and best printed copies to be found, and invited the most learned men from all parts of the Christian world to aid in the work; to these he joined a congregation of cardinals for their instruction and counsel, and being himself one of the most accomplished scholars of the age, he presided over all.

It is not strange that the whole Christian world regarded this edition, published in 1090, as perfect. But it was greatly improved under the auspices of Clement VIII., whose edition, published in 1592, contained not fewer than two thousand emendations on the text of his predecessor. This version received the sanction of the Council of Trent; and it has since been the standard of the Catholic Church. The most learned Protestant critics have admitted its general accuracy, including Grotius, Walton, Beza, and Casaubon. Even while religious controversy raged to such an extent as to seem likely to warp the judgment of the most liberal and most enlightened, the University of Oxford declared, in the preface to its edition of the Greek Testament published in 1675, that there was no version of the Bible in any language worthy of comparison with the Vulgate. We need speak of no more old editions for the present; the few we have alluded to, considered as examples, will give some idea of the difficulties which beset even the most learned men when they undertake so herculean a task as an improved translation of the Bible.

It is clear, then, that the man or men who come forward with a "corrected" version of the Testament should give some assurance to the public of two indispensable qualifications—good faith and ability. A version by Tom, Dick, or Harry is a thing to be thrown into the fire by those who have no means of judging whether it be God's word or not. Such a version can have no sacredness with the masses, since they have no grounds for believing it to be the Bible—the very Bible. We object to the "Common English Version Corrected," because coming to us without a single word of preface. What authority has it? Not a tenth part of our American citizens know anything about the Bible Union or the "Final Committee." What assurance have we of their good faith; and that being supposed, what proofs of their competency have been laid before us? Who are the "Final Committee" at all? Are they known, and worthy of trust, as biblical scholars?

And speaking of scholarship, another objection presents itself. The "Testament" is put into our hands as corrected by the "Final Committee." We could wish they had set forth, in general terms, in what our common and long-used English version needed correction. They seem to have forgotten that King James's version was received only upon the very highest human authority. All the learning of Europe, at least of the Protestant churches, was brought into requisition at the getting up of that version. After much consultation and consideration, some general rules for the guidance of the translators were arrived at, and sanctioned. These had to be observed, and were. Those who wrought out our common version were eminent and well-known scholars. They had, it may be said, moreover, all Europe in consultation; and the translation, when accomplished and corrected, received the approbation of the most learned divines of the Anglican and other Protestant churches. The writer of this paper is very anxious for the advance of biblical studies. We owe to many faults in our English version. We should certainly desire to see them corrected. We should wish, too, that a book which ought to be so constantly in the hands of all could be brought into closer harmony of expression with modern English than King James's version is. But a text prepared with such care and learning, handed down with such reverence by our fathers, *seculorum usu comprobatus*, we cannot see coolly set aside by an unknown committee without a protest. We protest against it as devoid of that external

uthority, that assurance and guarantee, wherewith a version f the Scriptures should come recommended. We decline to eceive it on *à priori* grounds. It may be good or it may be ad. Its merits or demerits we shall not stop to consider; or, indeed, would we presume to decide on all that is right r all that is wrong in any version. Blotches here and there e may discover in all versions; but which of them, all things onsidered, were the fittest to be received as a text-book in hurch and school, we must leave to learned divines to decide, ho can speak with more authority and judgment in he matter than we. We must be satisfied of such authority ere we substitute every text for the honored one of our thers. We cannot accept any new-fangled thing presented o us by this man or that, by a committee of New York or committee of Philadelphia, or any other would-be judges r correctors, as the word of God.

What the "Final Committee" attempted in the version efore us we have no means of knowing. We have no otion of plodding patiently through a book we utterly disard, to compare it line for line with our old version. A lance, however, at the Gospel of St. John shows us that hey undertook to modernize the language. How they have ucceeded we have no inclination to examine. We merely sk our readers, Is there anything more barbarous, from Mathew to Revelation, in King James's, than the following sentence from the first page of that gospel: "But as many as eceived him, to them gave he power to become children of od to them that *believe on his name?*"

We have now done with the Final Committee and *their* ew Testament. To justify the exception we have made to acaulay's proposition in favor of translators of the Holy cripture, we would beg our readers to examine one text ith us, and see how translators, for want of learning, have undered one after another in it. Take, for instance, St. ohn, chap. viii., v. 25: In the Greek we find "Ἔλεγον οὖν ὐτῷ Σὺ τίς εἶ; Καὶ εἶπεν αυτοῖς ὁ Ιησοῦς· Τὴν ἀρχὴν τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν."

The Saviour's answer to the question "Who art thou" is "Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν." Let us see what a mess ur translators have made of this passage.

The Latin Vulgate has "Principium, qui et loquor vobis." ut what does "Principium quis et loquor" mean, or how is it o be parsed? Principium, accusative (representing τὴν ρχὴν), governed how, or by what? Can any one suppose the

translator of the Vulgate knew himself what he meant when he penned these words? Credat Judæus—he did not. The words "principium qui et loquor vobis," taken singly each by itself, are indeed Latin words, but, taken as they stand together, are not Latin; they have no meaning. The translator did not understand his text, and was seemingly determined to justify his ignorance by challenging his Latin readers to make out a sentence which he called Latin.

The common English version, or King James's, renders the passage thus: "Who art thou? . . . . . Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning." Though this is anything but correct, it is preferable to the Vulgate. If a false translation, we have, at least, an English sentence; it is intelligible; it means something; whereas the Vulgate is mere nonsense. This much, however, is all we can claim for the Protestant reading. It is intelligible, and bears a meaning, but whose meaning is that—the translator's or St. John's? Not St. John's, but the translator's. The interpretation was first suggested, or at least advanced, and defended by the able Jesuit commentators Lapide and Maldonatus. The latter translates "(Ego sum) id quod vobis a principio loquor." *Την αρχην*, according to Maldonatus, must be taken as an adverbial expression with *κατα* understood, and having the force of *εξ αρχης* or *απ' αρχης*, *i. e.*, *a principio*, from the beginning. This were all well if it could only be shown that *την αρχην* is sometimes used adverbially in the signification of *απ' αρχης* or *εξ αρχης*. In the first place, we observe that *την αρχην* nowhere occurs in the Bible bearing such a meaning. But granted this argument would be insufficient, and that it may occur once, though no more, before such a meaning could be affixed to the words it were to be shown from profane authors that they may mean "from the beginning." But no passage of any Greek writer has yet been adduced to show that the words are capable of the meaning imposed on them in our common version. "From the beginning," then, is no more a translation of the Greek *την αρχην* than "from Calcutta" or "the Bay of Biscay" would be.

While on the subject let us point out another circumstance or two which tell against the English interpretation. St. John had frequently occasion to express the idea "from the beginning."* In all cases he expresses himself in the usual Greek formula of *απ'* or *εξ αρχης*. Again, the common interpretation entirely overlooks the structure; the order of

* See ch. vi., v. 64; xv., 27; xvi., 4, and First Ep., ch. ii., vs. 7 and 24.

words in the sentence. We have not *ο τι και την αρχην*, but *την αρχην ο τι και*, *κ. τ. λ.* It is ridiculous to suppose that the Evangelist, in giving a simple reply of the Saviour to a simple question, "Who art thou?" would make use of such a violent hyperbaton as our common interpretation demands. If the adverbial phrase *την αρχην* belonged to *λαλω*, meaning "I said from the beginning," the sentence would assuredly run *ο τι και την αρχην*, *κ. τ. λ.* But so it runs not.

But there still remains another serious objection to the common interpretation; one so plain and palpable that we wonder how it could have been so persistently overlooked by translators. Had St. John wished to express "as I said," we should not have the verb *λαλω* at all, but *λεγω*; nor should we have the verb in the present (*λαλω*), but in an aorist or preterit tense.

Next comes the Douay interpretation, which was adopted by the late Archbishop Kenrick, in his "Four Gospels:"* "The beginning who also speak to you." This is, if possible, still more meaningless than the Latin Vulgate. The word "beginning," in answer to the question "Who art thou?" is unquestionably in the nominative case, whereas principium, representing *την αρχην*, must be in the accusative. Again, "beginning" is made to stand antecedent to "who," while it is evident that neither its Latin nor Greek representative is the antecedent of the following pronoun. In a foot-note to this passage the archbishop modestly remarks: "As the passage is confessedly obscure, I have literally rendered the Vulgate, and presented the reader with the explanation of St. Augustine." But we have just shown that he did not literally render the Vulgate. As to the interpretation of St. Augustine, the learned archbishop should have been aware of the fact that St. Augustine was entirely mistaken as to the Greek text, reading the conjunctive *οτι* instead of the two pronouns *ο* and *τι*. Of course, this threw St. Augustine entirely out as to the meaning of the phrase.

In a later edition† the archbishop gives up this rendering and approaches the Protestant text, translating "As from the beginning I also say to you." Say what? The sentence is done. And such is presented to us as Christ's reply to the question "Who art thou?" Let us commend, however, all we can. We get something for the *και* ("also"), for which the

* New York, 1849. † Baltimore, 1862.

Protestant text shows nothing. For the rest, we have already proved that την αρχην does not mean "from the beginning." Still we like the version of 1862 better than that of 1849. In the former the archbishop recognises the necessity the translator—even a Catholic translator—is under of acting at times the role of interpreter. Besides, he gives up the old plea which read so stupid and faggish, and followed the Vulgate, when the world knew the Vulgate had nothing in it for him to follow. In passing, we may observe that the "Final Committee" have *not* "corrected" the mistranslation of την αρχην. They follow Archbishop Kenrick, "That which I also say to you from the beginning."

A word on a few foreign translations we have seen of this passage: The Abbé Glaire, in his edition of the New Testament,* thus renders the passage, "Ils lui dirent: Qui êtes vous? Jésus leur répondit, le principe moi-même qui vous parle." This only differs from the Rhemish in that it is a good deal worse. It has all the errors we pointed out in that version, and a clinching one of its own to boot, viz.: the introduction of the word "moi-même." Where on earth was this found? Then, what becomes of και, a particle that certainly holds a remarkable and significant place in the sentence?

De Sacy's translation is much the same. In the edition we are using † we read "(Je suis) le principe (de toutes choses) moi-même qui vous parle." Dr. Martini, in his Italian version, translates in like manner: "Il principio, io, che a voi parlo." That "io" he has inserted of himself, and of himself, too, has suppressed και, which he saw the Vulgate retain.

Dr. Allioli translates: ‡ Wer bist, du denn? Jesus sprach zu ihnen: Der Anfang, der auch zu euch redet." Like the Abbé Glaire, he manages to become a bit worse than either Vulgate or Rhemish. Besides all theirs, he has a fault over and above, all to himself: λαλω, loquor, becomes a third singular, "redet," in his hands. In a note he gives the following paraphrase and explanation of the text: "I am the Eternal Word which reveals itself to you. The Son of God calls himself the 'Beginning,' not only because he is the 'Begotten' of the Father before all time, but also because he is the source of all creation ('der Grund alles Geschaffe-

* Paris, 1861. † Bruxelles, 1844.
‡ Siebente Auflage-Munchen und Landshut, 1851.

nen.') "In Greek," adds he, "we find 'Ich bin was ich auch anfangs gesagt habe (das Licht der Welt,')" Ob., v. 11. In the Greek we find no such thing; λαλω is not "gesagt habe," nor is την αρχην correctly translated by "anfangs," as we have abundantly proved. We cannot pass all this over without calling the attention of our readers to the manner in which this author contradicts himself. In the explanation of the text he remarks that the Son of God "calls himself the Beginning," &c., and in the next sentence informs us that the Saviour never used the expression at all, but only "I am what I also said to you from (or in) the beginning, (anfangs), the Light of the world," as in v. 12. *

Kistemaker, in his tenth edition of his Testament,† renders it, "Der Anfang Der ich auch das zu euch sage." The best we can say of this rendering is to be silent. We should, indeed, be puzzled to put it into English. With the rest, he gives us "Der Anfang," nominative case for την αρχην. He makes an effort, however, to retain the accusative of λαλω, τι (Vulg. "quod loquor"), "*das* zu euch sage," and correctly puts the verb in the first person, "sage," not with Allioli in the third, "redet."

Weitenduer's version needs no special comment: "Der Anfang (aller Dinge) wie ich euch shon anfanglich gesagt habe." He works two words, "anfang" and "anfanglich," out of the single one αρχην. The only correct interpretation of this verse we have ever met with is that given by Dr. J. Th. Beelen in his Flemish edition of St. John's gospel: ‡ "(Ik ben) volstrekt dat, was ik ulieden ook leer (te weten, dè beloofde Messias)"—(I am) assuredly that what I also announce to you (to wit, the expected Messiah).

The whole interpretation hinges on the meaning of the word την αρχην. It must be borne in mind that nowhere else in the New Testament does the word occur, bearing the signification Beelen here attaches to it. But on this ground alone no one would contend that it should be rejected. Neither does it occur, as we remarked before, in the sense

* The versions of Martini, Allioli, and Glaire have been approved by the Holy See. It is proper to state, however, that this approbation is a mere negative one, not necessarily implying the endorsement of a single line of any of the works. But such as it is, since it is rarely granted, and never except to works that come before the Holy Father with the very highest encomiums, it gives any text so approved a considerable degree of authority. Besides the three mentioned, we know of only two other vernacular versions of the Holy Scriptures approved by the Pope: the Polish text of Father Wuicko and the Spanish version of Father Scio de S. Miguel. We have none in English.

† Munster, 1850. ‡ Louvain, 1862.

of απ' αρχης. But whereas no Greek author is found to have used the accusative adverbial αρχην or την αρχην in the sense of "from the beginning," there are various examples to prove that they employed it to mean plane, prorsus, omnino, volstrekt, assuredly.*

It is sufficient to note here that two Greek fathers, Chrysostom, in his Fifty-third Homily on St. John, and Theophilactus ad h. l., understood την αρχην in the sense of volstrekt, omnino, assuredly, expressing it by its equivalent adverb ολως. Owing, however, to a false reading of the text, both entirely misunderstood the passage. But this rather strengthens than impairs their testimony as to the signification which the adverbial phrase την αρχην may obtain.†

Beelen's interpretation, then, exactly accords with the original; it is clear, simple, and literal:

Την αρχην	ο	τι	και	λαλω	υμιν.
Volstrekt	dat	was	ook	leer	relieden.
Assuredly	that	what	also	I teach	you.

Each Greek word has its equivalent in the vernacular, and the whole passage exactly suits the context.

But it may be asked, if the Saviour meant nothing more than "I am what I also announce to you," why he did not say at once "Εγω ειμι ον με ειναι λεγω," and from the fact of his not employing the usual mode of expression, are we not to conclude that he insinuated in that obscure phrase something more than the ordinary and plain expression would imply? We do not deny that the Saviour might have answered, "I am what to-day I am;" but the text as it stands is far more pregnant, and more in accordance with the context.

"If you believe not," said the Saviour, v. 24, "that I am, you shall die in your sins." This verse is in reality the great puzzle. What did he wish them to believe? "That I am." It was not certainly this existence standing as he was befor ethem. The Jews were no Berkeleyites. Yet the object he proposed to their belief must have been something of the last importance, as we gather from the emphasis of the sentence, and the warning, "You shall die in your sins." What, then, does he demand belief in by το, "That I am."

* See Raphelius, Annotationes in S. Scripturam, tom. 1, page 638, Lugduni Batav., 1750. See also "Grondregels voor het vervaardigen eener Vertaling van het Nieuwe Testamet door J. Th. Beelen," page 74 seq., Amsterdam, 1858; and Vigerus, "Annotationes Hermanni," Lips., 1822, page 80, note 2, and p. 728.

† They read ο and τι as one word, which forced them to suppose an ellipsis of some verb. See "Grondregels," page 74, note 1.

r Lord," says Archbishop Kenrick, "evidently means
re his hearers an insight into this divine nature, and
them to recognise it." The archbishop favors the
on of St. Augustine, that "I am" is here used to
e essential being, even as God said to Moses, אֶהְיֶה
אֲשֶׁר "sum qui sum." I am who I am. Herein the arch-
p is entirely astray. Through the whole chapter the
of the Saviour's discourse is to impress upon his hearers
dea that he is "The One sent by the Father."*
at the Jews well understand what he meant in asserting
he was sent by the Father is evident from collateral
ture authority and Jewish tradition. John the Baptist,
istance,† sends two of his disciples to ask Jesus was he
One Coming, "ὁ ἐρχόμενος" (הַבָּא) habbah. "Sent by
Father,"‡ was well understood by his auditors as
by God. Compare v. 41. Bearing in mind the
tations of the Jews, ο ερχομενος ο Χριστος, and the
a Patre, vs. 16, 18, were unmistakable and synonymous
. When Christ, therefore, asserted (v. 12) that he was
Light of the world," and (vs. 16 and 18) that he was "sent
e Father" the Jews well understood him to announce
he was the Messiah. But they refuse to believe, and
him questions in ironical ignorance, (vs. 19 and 22.)
reat Jesus, never heeding the irony, denounces, (v. 24) their
dulity, and threatens they shall die in their sins if they
ve not that *He is* (the One sent by the Father). Now,
id of that emphatic "I am," "οτι ειμι," Jesus must have
in the dialect of Jerusalem, הוּא אֲנָא, ana hou, i. e., *I he*, or
One. In the context, v. 24 might be translated, "If you
ve not that I am he, you shall die," &c. Compare Acts,
iii., v. 25: "When John was drawing towards the end of
ourse, he was wont to say, Whom think ye that I am?"
κ ειμι εγω," "non sum ego" "not I am," which St. John
have expressed in his own dialect, הוּא אֲנָא לָא (lah anah
, not I he, or I am not the One, but behold cometh after
, &c. John the Baptist was just as intelligible in this wise
e Jews as when he replied. John, ch. i., v. 20, ουκ ειμι ο
τος. The εγω ειμι, therefore, of vs. 24 and 28, refer
s Bishop Kenrick supposed, to the Saviour's divine nature,
o the Messianic character of Jesus. We have no objection
ying, with the archbishop, that Christ, in the course of
onversation here related, hinted at his divine nature, and
ed to lead his hearers to a recognition of the same (see v. 58).

* See vs. 14, 16, 18. 23, 26, 28, 29, 36, 38, 40, 42.
† Luke, ch. vii., v. 19. ‡ Vs. 16 and 18.

This was secondary, however. His main purport was to bring out his Messiahship, that he was the One sent, the One coming. But to return to our text. The archbishop is greatly mistaken in attaching the same meaning to the εγω ειμι of this verse which the words bear in verses 24 and 28. Notwithstanding the Jews well understood what Jesus taught or declared of himself in the preceding part of his discourse, they now (v. 25) put him the ironical and impertinent question, "Who art thou?" The Saviour has but to reiterate, with emphasis, την αρχην, that he is that what he also announces to them—ὁ, nominative case, in answer to the question, and neuter, because referring to the abstract idea of his office or mission. To seize the full force of the second member, τι και λαλω υμιν, we must call to mind the outset of the Saviour's discourse. In v. 12, he asserted that he was the "Light of the world." The Pharisees take him up, and object that he is his own herald, and, as such, unworthy of trust—that his testimony is not true. Christ replies that his testimony is true, albeit coming from himself; for he knows whence he cometh, and, furthermore, he is not alone his own witness, for the Father is with him, and beareth witness to him (vs. 14, 16, 18). The και λαλω in the second member of Christ's answer (vs. 25), "I also declare," has reference to the refusal of the Jews to accept his own declaration (v. 13). He now threatens (vs. 24–25) that they shall die in their sins if they refuse to believe him to be the Messiah; and, to their question, repeats emphatically that he is that what he also preaches himself to be.

Those of our readers who wish to see the whole subject of vernacular versions treated in a manner at once comprehensive, learned, and interesting, we would confidently refer to Dr. Beelen's work already cited, i.e., *Grondregels*, &c. But it requires little learning or research to see that the version of the "Final Committee" is by no means final, except so far as its numerous blunders, as well as its crude, harsh, and yet pedantic style, may serve as a warning to others to undertake only what they are competent to fulfil. As remarked at the outset, we have declined to criticise it in this paper, further than to refer to a single passage as a specimen of the *tout ensemble*, but we intend to take up a chapter or two on a future occasion, and compare them with the original as well as with other English versions, if only for the purpose of showing our readers that the *quasi* pundits of the Final Committee would require to go to school a little longer.

ART. VII.—1. *Principles of Human Physiology, with their chief application to Psychology, Pathology, Therapeutics, Hygiene, and Forensic Medicine.* By WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M. D., F. R. S., &c., &c. Philadelphia, 1856.

Clinical Lectures on the principles and practice of Medicine. By JOHN HUGHES BENNETT, M.D., F. R. S., Professor of Institutes of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. New York.

Histoire de la Medicine. Par Daniel Leclerc, Genève.

Histoire de la Medicine depuis son origine jusqu'au dix-neuvieme siècle. Paris, 1846.

Institutions historiæ Medicinæ. Nuremberg.

A SOUND condition of body being a prerequisite to the roper exercise of every faculty, one would naturally look far ack into antiquity for the first observations on the disturb- ig causes of health, and would expect to find them only by eep thought and patient research. Yet the recorded views f men who have devoted themselves to such enquiries are ery few and unreliable when we carry our ken beyond the me of Hippocrates. Mythology furnishes some informa- on on medical matters in the earliest historic times, but ven that is a garbled tradition of the pre-Hellenic epoch. omer makes mention of two physicians, Machaon and Pod- lirus, whose chief skill consisted in staunching wounds and ffecting a temporary alleviation of pain. Were it not, in- eed, for the famed story of Æsculapius, we would scarcely ave proof sufficient to establish the existence of medical ien as a separate class among the earliest communities. 'his tradition, however, conclusively shows that as far back s authentic and even legendary history goes, there existed ien who made disease and the healing art a special study, nd derived their means of subsistence from the practice of heir craft. Beyond this, however, very little has been handed own to us, and it is probable very little could, for obser- ations and theories which proceeded on the assumed truth f the crude philosophic systems of the early Greek and astern schools, must have been either barren of result or ntirely false.

This applies especially to principles and facts under- ying pathology and therapeutics, for isolated obser- ations and the description of symptoms were both nu-

merous and marked by much acuteness even before the time of Hippocrates. The works of this great man were the first embodiment of the studies and observations of those who had preceded him; they remain to this day a monument of unwearied industry and wonderful fidelity to nature. Yet the restrictions placed on human dissections and the undeveloped state of collateral science led him into countless grave errors. But that which especially detracted from the usefulness of the labors of Hippocrates was his constant identification of effect with cause, mistaking the symptoms of disease for the disease itself. And here it may be well to mark a fallacy which has greatly retarded medical science from Hippocrates to Cullen, and has radically falsified every system of nosology. In medicine, as in all unmatured sciences, effects have been mistaken for causes, the signs of facts for the facts themselves; and hence systems, proteus-like, changing every day. Ignorance of sound physiology and anatomy precluded the true solution of the various diseased conditions of the human system, and hence the explanation of the effects was sought for in the effects themselves. The immediate successors of Hippocrates added but little to the researches and discoveries of the Father of Medicine, and we have no record of improvement down to the time of the Ptolemies. The Alexandrian School of Medicine instituted a new manner of enquiry in harmony with its own philosophy. The analytical method naturally pointed to dissection as the true means of unlocking the secrets of the human frame, and shedding light on the multifarious phenomena of disease. For awhile the Alexandrian doctors devoted themselves with ardor to the study of disease in its various forms, seeking to connect its phenomena with the facts and principles dissection had revealed to them. Their labors were productive of grand results, and remained for a long time a beacon light to all students of nature. Herophilus, the most celebrated of their number, made six hundred dissections, and so great was his authority in medical matters that the following saying, remarkable only for bad Latinity and false principle, passed into an aphorism: "Contradicere Herophilo in anatomicis est contradicere evangelium."

But the same tendency to philosophize and draw inferences from unwarranting premises, which marked the comparative anatomy studies of Aristotle, greatly detracted from the utility of those labors, and the ruin which involved

he famous Alexandrian library robbed us of the fruits of the lexandrian researches. But the destruction which overtook he works of the Alexandrians did not await the principles iscovered by them. On the authority of Galen we may efer the most important system of early medicine to hilinus, an immediate disciple of Herophilus. Hippocrates id not confine himself to observation, but, impelled by he activity of his enquiring mind, sought to assign causes nd invent theories. This laid the foundation of dogmaism, and soon the Hippocratic physicians, discarding bservation completely, studied disease by the light of ure reason. The result was a speedy lapse into insane nd fruitless speculation. To counteract this pernicious endency, Philinus, instructed by the example of Herohilus, strongly urged the necessity of a return to observaion and clinical studies, ridiculing the mystical doctrines of he dogmatists. His efforts were eminently successful, for oon he found himself surrounded by a brilliant host of obervers, who severely condemned the dogmatic doctrines, and stablished the system of empiricism. Many names of remarkble empiricists have been handed down to us, the most celebrated being Heraclides of Tarentum, the first to introduce pium into practice.*

In the system of the empiricists we discover the germ of the modern inductive method, and therefore feel no surprise that it should have led to many valuable discoveries. Its chief contributions, however, were in the materia medica, for so thoroughly had it set itself in opposition to the dogmatic system, that it abstained from deep pathological studies for fear of running into speculation. The empiricists, therefore, confined themselves almost entirely to the testing of various remedies in the different diseases and conditions of the system, and little came from their labors except a knowledge of the efficacy and mode of administration of certain drugs. But had not even such a practical result flowed from the empiric theories, yet incalculable benefit followed the changed direction of the medical mind, from enquiries into essential and inscrutable causes to the real and the tangible. The other systems of medicine which grew up in the East were more or less connected with the superstitious religions of the time, or had their origin in the mystical systems of philosophy of Anaxagoras, Zeno, and Pythagoras. Proceeding to the West,

* Galen, De subfigurat. Empir., Cap. Ult.

we find the cultivation of medicine little attended to by the people of Italy, and Pliny assures us that the Roman people had been without a physician during a period of six hundred years. There were several temples consecrated to numerous deities, whose intervention was all the people could depend upon, even in the severest epidemics. Thus Tomasini* gives an inscription taken from a votive tablet dedicated to the goddess who presided over fevers :

"Febri divæ febri
Sancto febri magno
Camilla Amuta pro
Filio male affecto P."

Macrobius mentions a goddess called Ossifyga, who presided over the growth of the bones, and the goddess Carna, who took charge of the thorax and abdomen.† It is by many supposed that the slaves of wealthy Roman masters were the first to practise the healing art at Rome, and for this reason the profession was for a long time held in disrepute. About one hundred years before the Christian era, Asclepeiades came to Rome, and having failed as a teacher of rhetoric turned his attention to medicine. From the little we know of his mode of practice we can imagine him to have been the pink of impostors, for he rendered himself great by decrying the works of his predecessors, and by working alternately on the fears and ignorance of the Romans. Yet from Celsus we learn that he first introduced the distinction between chronic and acute diseases, and thus greatly contributed to the advancement of the science. He also introduced the antiphlogistic regime, pushing it to an extreme degree. Herein, however, his immediate successor and disciple Themison, of Saodicèa, greatly outshone him, having often reduced his unhappy patients to the verge of starvation. His successes may be estimated by the line of Juvenal,

"Quot Themison ægros autumno occiderat uno."

This Themison founded a system called by him *Methodism*, which seemed to combine the practical tendency of empiricism with that proneness to speculate which marked the system of the dogmatists. But the wide compass of questions which it undertook to solve, without any well-defined

* In Grov. Thesaur. Roman Antiquit., vol. xii., p. 867.
† Macrob. Saturnal., lib. 1, p. 12, 8 ed. Ald.

d of proceeding, at once took from it all individuality
ystem. After the time of Themison the study and
e of medicine spread very rapidly in Rome, and soon
ame customary for physicians to visit their patients
panied by their pupils. To such a practice the follow-
igramme of Martial would seem to point:

"Languebam; sed tu comitatus protinus ad me
Venisti, centum, Symmache, discipulis
Centum me tetigere manus aquilone geltæ
Non habui febrem, Symmache; nunc habeo."

e methodic school, though no longer preserving its
y further than the name, gave many other celebrated
Rome. We may mention Soranus and Calius Aure-
the former a native of Ephesus, the latter an African
th. This Calius Aurelianus wrote a work on the
progress, and treatment of disease, which is considered
the most valuable that has been handed down to us
ntiquity, and though bearing the stamp of the iron
its style, it contains most accurate and graphic de-
ns of disease. In the time of the Emperor Trajan
ufus, a man to whom medical science is greatly in-
, and whose anatomical discoveries are verified by the
lissections. Though he did not use his scalpel on the
subject, he found sufficient in the brain and viscera
and other animals to build up a system of analogical
y. His works have been edited in England by
, and are frequently quoted by modern writers on
ne.

this epoch appeared the elder Pliny, who collected in
toria Mundi all the systems which had been broached
ippocrates down, and though his own studies did not
that direction, yet he has interwoven in his history
icine many original reflections and set forth many
all which bespeak the profound mind of the great
ist. Few names of importance meet us from Pliny
n, though the number of enquirers had commenced
tiply exceedingly. Galen revived the practice of
rates, which had fallen into desuetude, and set him-
ently to work to restore the principles and teachings
great Coan Physician. His splendid talents and un-
ssiduity soon enabled him to outstrip his master, and
hed him as the first authority in medical matters, a
n he held undisputed claim to till the commencement

of the sixteenth century. Of him Cabanis says: "Dissatisfied with what his masters taught him as incontrovertible truths, and as the immutable principles of the art, he read Hippocrates' works, and was struck, as it were, with a new light. In comparing them with nature his astonishment and admiration redoubled; and Hippocrates and Nature thenceforth became the only preceptors to whose instructions he would listen." It was not, however, in the same field with Hippocrates that Galen distinguished himself, for he did not turn his attention, like Hippocrates, to the study of disease by the bedside, but devoted himself to anatomy and physiology, and it was in the former branch especially that his authority was paramount. Indeed, so deeply rooted was the reverence with which all regarded the authority of Galen, that nerves, muscles, and blood-vessels which he had stated to exist were accepted on his authority alone, though against the repeated evidence of experience. His name had become as infallible authority in medicine as that of Aristotle in philosophy, and there was no appeal from the *ipse dixit* of the master. Once, however, that unshackled minds began to question this authority his name lost its influence and prestige, for it was found that he had stated many things on insufficient grounds, and had drawn conclusions too hastily. With Galen departed the greatness of early medicine, for though many, especially among the Greeks, still labored in the walks of science, they were little more than mere compilers, and medicine began to feel the retrograde influence which marked the approaching downfall of the Roman Empire.

From this period to the revival of science in the age of Dante we have but confused and unsatisfactory accounts of medical progress. Indeed, it would seem, from the downfall of the Roman Empire to the revival in the thirteenth century medicine had passed into the hands of a class of men who had in view their own interest solely, and made the healing art the handmaid of barbarity and superstition. The most cruel and absurd remedies were used, many of which at once violated decency and inflicted extraordinary suffering on poor patients. We will mention *hoplochrysma*, or anointing the instrument which inflicted a wound; the healing of scrofulous sores by the touch of royalty; the entrails of toads used for the cure of certain diseases; and the sympathetic powder, which, if applied to the blood-stained garments of a wounded person, had the reputed virtue of healing the wound, though the

rer were at a distance. In the East, however, the same ding causes not being at work, medicine found many n and successful prosecutors. But a provision in the ious code of the Mohammedans, by which human dissec- is forbidden, debarred Eastern physicians from the rich- ource of medical knowledge, and though their descrip- of maladies are very truthful, and their list of simples remedies very full, they failed to create a system, or nce one well-sustained theory. The intellectual activ- vhich characterized the close of the thirteenth century nded itself to medicine, and the first effort made was to ithral science from the dominion of superstition and latanism. Men now began to labor for the truth, and not e affrighted if their intellect inclined them to approve t did not strictly conform to the square and compass of totelian logic. The inductive method began to be prac- l, and this, like the method of the Alexandrian physi- s, pointed to dissection as the key to medical science. ordingly we find the first modern dissection of the human ect made by an Italian physician, Mondini de Luzzi, ards the close of the thirteenth century. The results, ever, were not followed up very zealously, for public udice and short-sighted legislation placed an insurmount- barrier between the student of nature and the means of nding his enquiries. A period of stagnation therefore owed, and though the causes which were silently effect- radical and permanent changes in the tone of the Euro- n mind were influencing medicine as well as other sci- s, yet, not eliciting the same attention as religion and al and political sciences, the latter made but little pro- s.

Vesalius, a distinguished physician of the sixteenth cen- , resumed the labors of Mondini, and laid the founda- of our present anatomical knowledge. The character of man entitles him to more than a passing mention here, his virtues impart additional weight to his labors and dis- eries. Wedded by religious bent to an ascetic and red life, practising the noblest precepts of morality, he itated not to revive human dissections, former attempts which, as in the case of Mondini, had provoked general pproval and the censure of the authorities. Vesalius, ever, strong in the conviction of right, defied the anger he populace, and in the presence of the crucifix, with s uplifted to heaven, imploring the divine blessing

on his work, performed the first modern dissection which has led to permanent results. The purity of his intentions, and the noble views which animated him, have helped to remove the scales from the eyes of law-makers and to destroy the deep-rooted prejudice which ranked dissection among the works of darkness. Ambrose Parè was the first to turn to practical account, in surgery, the labors of his predecessors, and by his position as surgeon to several European sovereigns was enabled to obtain widespread notoriety for the principles he taught and practised. Paré systematized the disconnected researches of former surgeons, and made the first valuable contributions to the magnificent structure since reared by John Hunter, Dupuytren, Abernethy, and Sir Astley Cooper.

Similar progress marked the other branches of the science, especially obstetrics, which was rescued from the hands of empirics by the labors and studies of Saxtroph of Copenhagen, and Solayres de Renhac of Montpelier. The last century and the commencement of the present were marked by numerous and important improvements in every department of medicine; and both Great Britain and the Continent furnished many names which will live for ever in the archives of the science. Italy boasts the names of Lancisi, Morgagni, Monteggia, Scarpa and Asselini; Holland, Albinus, Camper, and Boerhaave; Germany, Haller, Heister, and Soemmering; France, Dupuytren and the illustrious Bichat; England, Cullen and the Hunters; while America need feel no shame at the name of Benjamin Rush.

But the labors of those men, numerous and useful as they are, pale before the brilliant wonders of the last forty years. Physical examinations, chemical tests, microscopical histology, and the use of anæsthetics in surgery are but a few of the inappreciable benefits of this century. To present a full tabular statement of the improvements the last forty years have witnessed in every department of medicine, would be a task almost interminable, and altogether beyond our purpose. It is not so much our aim to present striking or original views to professional men, as to interest the general reader in such progressive changes as have elevated medicine to the rank of a science, rendered it a potent agency of civilization, and entitled its patrons to the respect and gratitude of enlightened men. Many persons, even among the better informed, grossly misjudge the character and influence of medicine, measuring it rather by what it has failed to accomplish than by the wonders it

ealized. These people constantly complain that medi- has not more than half covered the field of investigation ; the subjective portion of the science is jejune, compared the unlimited domain of the objective ; that mortal will ache and weary for many a day before medical ırces can relieve all the ills to which it is heir. In their ıation, every science is purely constructive, and tends to ction, not in proportion to what has been actually ac- ɔlished, but to the decreasing demand it may be called ı to meet. Thus, let a new and intricate legal problem , and the solution of it will be at once discovered in the ing principles of law, for this is a constructive science, ıdvances, *pari passu*, with the requisitions that are made ı it. But how different in medicine—a science based on , and not on theoretic principles, and whose field of iry is commensurate with the three physical kingdoms ıture. As regards such persons, therefore, our aim is to ince them that in the domain of medical research the ın mind has operated with as much activity and success any other field, and that the labors of medical enquirers ɔ be estimated by the positive results reached, and not ıe width of ground left unexplored. Moreover, some may be given to the crusade undertaken in the s of this Review against an unprincipled class of who batten on the credulity of the people, by con- ng the solid and profound labors of recognised medi- ıvestigators, their great erudition, their conscientious re- for duty, and their consequent reliability, with the glitter insel, the hollowness and immorality of quacks, empirics, innovators.

he practical applications of medicine depend for ss on the knowledge of physiology, which in turn to anatomical science for the means of reaching rity. We may therefore consider anatomy as funda- al, and must first enquire what developments it has lately ved, and how such developments have been effected. ction revealed to the enquirers of the last century and ommencement of the present nearly all the facts of my which the unaided eye could discover, so we must elsewhere for the agent which has enabled later anato- to make so many and such valuable contributions to ce. Such an agent is the microscope. This instrument, n as far back as the seventeenth century, was for a long held in light estimation, being considered of no greater

importance than a means of agreeable pastime. Robert Hooke in 1667, and Leewoenhock, whose researches are recorded in the Philosophical Transactions of 1673, first brought microscopy to bear on the sciences and were richly rewarded for their pains. Their few and simple discoveries were hailed as precursive to new and most important enquiries, and the attention of opticians was at once directed to the means of improving the simple instrument hitherto employed. But little progress, however, was effected, even after the introduction of combined lenses, till after the first quarter of the present century, when a means of correcting chromatic aberration was discovered, since which time the instrument has become a power, the grasp and ken of which can be measured but by the marvels it has disclosed, the grand hopes it has realized. It has created a new science in the bosom of anatomy; it has poured a flood of light on the ultimate structure of animal organization; so that histology, or the science of tissue-making, is now regarded as the phase of anatomical science most pregnant with truth, most fraught with brilliant hopes for the future. Every tissue of the body has been subjected to the searching gaze of the microscopist, and a collation of results has led to the enunciation of this law, that all living organisms are the products of elementary cells, the differences in which determine the differences of the product. The influence of this law on physiological researches may be appreciated when we state that every difference of structure implies a difference of function; whence it is to be inferred that tissues which the naked eye proclaims identical in structure and in functions differ in both those respects when the microscope has revealed a difference in their primordeal cells. Of the application of these laws we have a striking illustration in the mucous and serous membranes of the body, touching which some physiologists and anatomists maintain that the knowledge of the intimate structure of those tissues would lead *a priori* to a knowledge of their functions. Cells in general consist of an outer wall, a contained substance, either liquid or solid, and a nucleus. They are differently shaped, being either spheroidal, fusiform, star shaped, caudate, or polyhedral. They develop themselves differently, the difference depending on the results to which they give rise.

The latest microscopists give two fundamental modes of development, the one taking place by a division *de novo* of the cell itself, the other by the creation of new cells through

he operation of the vital forces, in a fluid prepared for that urpose. The secondary modes of development are more umerous, but the chief among them are duplicative subdivi- ion, where the parent cell itself is split, giving rise to two r more new cells ; and endogenous development within the ell, where the nucleus is split and the parent cell perishes. n this manner are all the tissues of the body developed ; and, s has been heretofore remarked, on the characteristics of the hape and the manner of development of a cell depend the eculiarities of the function of the organ which springs from t. Thus microscopy, going back to the *ultima ratio* of animal rganization, has traced, step by step, its successive develop- nent from a simple cell to that marvellous structure man, the eauty of the world, the paragon of animals. Not only has he normal growth and structure of the body been revealed y the microscope, but it has thrown wonderful light on the inute changes produced by morbid conditions of the ystem. In this way it has become an invaluable means of iagnosis and there is a prospect that continued microscopical bservations will disclose a peculiarity of cell formation and levelopment in every diseased organ as it has already done n the case of cancerous growths.

The liver and the eye may be taken as type cases of what nicroscopy has accomplished in the minute anatomy of pecial organs. The liver, for a long time viewed as a homo- eneous mass, suddenly revealed to the eye of the micro- copist a structure most complex and beautiful, a symmetry nd design everywhere visible, the minutest portion exhibit- ng on the field of the microscope an arrangement of lobules, ells, nerves, and bloodvessels, that challenged the warmest dmiration. To Kiernan and Handfield Jones in Great ritain, and Kolliker in Germany, we are indebted for those nteresting microscopical discoveries in this organ. The tudy of the minute anatomy of the liver immediately rought a complete change in the physiological views which ad been held concerning it, so that it is no longer considered mere manufactory for bile, but as discharging the far more nportant rôle of repairing the waste of nervous tissues. mong the productions of the liver, cholesterine has been pecially remarked, and numerous experiments have shown at this substance is much employed in the active processes the nervous system. Thus the liver, instead of secreting a ere excrementitious substance, for such to a great extent is ile, is invested with the far nobler function of supplying a

waste occasioned by the exercise of our highest faculties. Pathology, ever looking to physiology for new developments, availed itself of this discovery to abandon the use of drugs which had for effect the constant stimulation of the liver, and, as Dr. Van Buren, of the New York University, lately remarked, the day is not far distant when the liver will cease to be considered a mere objective term for calomel.

The eye also offers an instance where the labors of microscopical observers have been brought to bear with the happiest results. The discovery of the retinal expansion of the optic nerve, or Jacob's membrane, has wonderfully helped to elucidate the phenomenon of vision. Those exquisite nerve fibres spread over the retina seemed specially fitted to take cognisance of the delicate undulations of light. Indeed, proceeding on the data furnished by the microscopical anatomy of the eye, Dr. Draper has propounded a theory of color-vision which bids fair to supersede all hitherto received views.

As in every science where the mind has deployed its activity with success, so in anatomy men have passed the limit of the experimental and gone into the region of the speculative and transcendental. We have, therefore, a transcendental as well as a microscopical anatomy; and though the speculations have not as yet assumed a very orderly shape, they at least testify to the ardor with which anatomical science is cultivated. Within that happy mean, those bounds—

"Quos utra citraque nequit consistere rectum."

Such speculations give forth much that is beautiful and true; but the German medical mind, taking the cue from the philosophy of Fichte and Schelling, has evinced a tendency to transcendentalize beyond measure. Transcendental anatomy has for its object to reduce and simplify organic types, to establish harmony and unity of design in the various forms of animal life, and thus fill the mind with the depth and the riches of that wisdom which has known how to engraft infinite variety on wonderful unity and order. Already one important result of those speculations has been to refer rudimentary organs to this design of nature to preserve unity of type in all her works. Thus the rudimentary mammæ of the male are doubtless for the purpose of rendering less striking the necessary imperfection involved in the distinction of the sexes. Passing now from these reflections, and the countless benefits microscopical labors have bestowed on medical

science, especially within the last ten years, we come to the consideration of a question, the practical solution of which, but lately discovered, has robbed surgical operations of their most formidable feature. Ever since surgery became an art, humane men have sought a means of mitigating the fearful pain attending its operations, for not even the most hardened could steel himself against the shrieks wrung from the agonized victims of the knife. Indeed, if we carry ourselves back in thought to the day when wretched sufferers were bound hand and foot to the operating table, with nerves strung to the keenest sensibility by visions of blood and torture, we cannot but hail the discovery of anæsthetics as a crowning benefaction to human kind. Berzelius was the first to direct attention to the anæsthetical properties of oxygen and hydrogen combined, the elements which enter so largely into the composition of sulphuric ether and chloroform. "Une atmosphére composé," he says, "de gaz oxygene ou de gaz hydrogene substitue au gaz hydrogene rend au bout de quelque temps lourd et comme engourdi mais ne produit pas d'autres signes de maladies." His experiments, however, were confined to Guinea pigs, and led to nothing permanent. Sir Humphrey Davy succeeded, by means of nitrous oxide, in producing a partial and transient anæsthesia, and the anæsthetical power of ether was alluded to by Professor Samuel Jackson in 1833. Not, however, till the year 1846 was such a state of insensibility produced as to render a cutting operation quite painless.

In 1845, Dr. Morton experimented with sulphuric ether, and frequently by means of it extracted teeth without causing pain. In October of the following year he induced Dr. Warren to administer it in a severe surgical operation in the Massachusetts General Hospital, and the results surpassed the most sanguine hopes. Immediately a patent was granted to Dr. Morton by the United States Government, and after that few serious operations were performed in any hospital in the country till the patient was first brought under the anæsthetical influence of sulphuric ether. But Dr. Morton did not long retain the undisputed title to the discovery of this inestimable boon to sufferers; and though it is not our intention to discuss the merits of the "Ether Controversy," we will state the general results which follow from it. Dr. Jackson contended that he had made successful experiments with ether many months prior to Dr. Morton's first recorded attempts, and the Paris Medical

Academy gave the semblance of truth to this claim by awarding a prize to Dr. Jackson, a judgment it shortly after reversed by the bestowal of a similar prize on Dr. Morton. Many, however, are even yet of opinion that Dr. Horace Wells is the true discoverer, and that Morton treacherously wrested the secret from him. Those pretensions, put forward by the widow of Dr. Wells, could not, however, be sustained before a court of law.

Like many great discoveries which have stamped epochs in the history of the world, the introduction of anæsthetical agents in surgery may be considered a combined result of minds operating at different times and places. In 1847, Dr. Simpson, of Edinburgh, substituted chloroform for sulphuric ether, having found it a far more powerful, though more dangerous anæsthetic. True, it does not fill up the air passages, thereby causing danger of suffocation, as does sulphuric ether, but it reduces the activity of the circulation with great rapidity. For awhile it obtained general favor, till nearly one hundred fatal cases occurring in quick succession caused it to be regarded with great dread, and a general cessation of its use followed. It was resumed when a few experiments proved its efficacy in difficult cases of parturition, an efficacy all the more wonderful as the peculiar condition of the system at the time of labor renders the administration of it very much safer. Here, however, the use of chloroform met many and vehement adversaries, some contending that it diminished the safety of instrumental delivery, while others maintained that it nullified the divine injunction, "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth," and even to-day many practitioners of the old school would be horrified at the mention of chloroform in connection with parturition. A more enlightened sentiment, however, recognises the inestimable blessings which have flowed both from chloroform and ether in the hands of prudent and educated men, and attaches no weight to the puerile objections urged against their use.

Though the introducton of anæsthetical agents may be viewed as the most important advance in modern surgery, other and later improvements bespeak for their authors much greater skill and ingenuity. And as an American hospital witnessed the first painless surgical operation, so from American hospitals have issued the latest and most useful surgical improvements and appliances. Thus we find that to Americans are accredited the following among many late additions to surgery: the

imple and effective plan of adhesive strips, instead of the umbrous and unsatisfactory apparatus before employed; lastic extension by weights and pulleys, introduced by Dr. Buck, of New York Hospital; plaster of Paris casts instead f starch splints for keeping fractures and dislocations in osition; Davis's splint for hip-joint disease; hypodermic njections of morphia, an admirable means of relieving local pain, the morphia is injected beneath the skin; scarification of the glottis for œdema, a difficult operation, but successfully performed by Dr. Buck, of New York Hospital; the operation for strangulated hernia without opening the sac; the use of water-bed in injuries of the spine. Here the credit is due to Dr. Arnott, of London. But a categorical enumeration of all late and important improvements in surgery would lead us far beyond our purpose, so we will content ourselves with a reference to one or two more. Dr. Marion Simms, of New York, at present residing in Paris, has introduced many and signal changes in the manner of treating the surgical diseases of women. The use of silver sutures in vaginal fistulas would alone entitle him to an eminent rank in his profession. Dr. Emmett, of New York, is Dr. Simms' representative in this country, and frequently performs his most difficult operations. The other improvement acquires additional interest from the fact that it is connected with a notable event in European politics. It will be remembered that a few years ago Garibaldi was severely wounded in the foot at Aspro Monte, during an engagement with a regiment of Victor Emanuel's army. The ball lodged among the small bones of the foot, and could not at first be distinguished from the shattered fragments around. Several eminent surgeons from London and Paris vainly attempted to extract the ball, till Dr. Nélaton of the latter city devised the following ingenious means of distinguishing the lead from the bones: He adapted a small spherical piece of Sevres china to a handle, and with this probed the wound. The surface of the china was at once blackened by contact with the lead, and thus the precise position of the ball was ascertained. Though very simple, this little instrument has proved exceedingly useful during the present war; and the writer has witnessed operations of the most serious character, where, but for this ingeniously constructed probe, nothing could have been done.*

* Dr. Gouley, late Surgeon to the Central Park Hospital, discovered, by means of this probe, a bullet lodged in the substance of the brain, amid fragments of the frontal sinuses, and successfully extracted it.

These are a few of the numerous improvements which have lately marked the progress of surgery, and according as surgical anatomy and mechanical skill receive further developments, many other important additions will be made to this branch of medical science. Progress in the other departments of medicine has not kept pace with the rapid developments of surgery, for in the other—and especially in the practice of medicine proper—the field of view is more sinuous and obscure than in surgery. The rancor of dispute which pervaded the schools of philosophy gradually crept into medicine; and humoralism and solidism gave as wide scope for endless though not fruitless discussion, as did the question of nominalism and realism among the schoolmen. Most that has been written on the *questio vexata*, as to whether disease has its seat in the liquid or solid portions of the body, now moulders forgotten on library shelves, but not without having sown seed which has since borne magnificent fruit. In those tournaments of the mind, those controversies wherein solemn trifles don the imposing garb of erudition, we find the latent germ of modern practice. Medical enquirers, from Hippocrates to those of the last century, seemed to view disease as a positive entity, a formidable foe, whose expulsion from the system formed the chief aim of medicine. This theory of disease could not fail to exercise a baneful influence on therapeutics, for it became a question to dislodge an enemy by a regular siege of ditch, scarp, and counterscarp, and not to assist and support the waning powers of nature. Hence what was called the *heroic* plan of treatment, which consisted in administering drugs *ad nauseam*, in bleeding, depressing, purging, and blistering, till the enemy had to surrender. As a result of the controversies alluded to, disease began at last to be looked upon in its proper light, as a negation of health, and not as a distinct entity residing in the system. When acute minds perceived the fallacious principle that underlay the treatment in vogue, they turned to study the means of helping nature in her efforts towards recovery. A deep and wide-spread revolution was then effected in the practice of medicine, a revolution which continues to this day, and which has worked out many changes for the better and for the worse. Among the former, happily the more numerous, a restriction to such drugs as a rational understanding of disease indicated, may be instanced as of primary importance. But this decided step in advance became the occasion of a great and growing delusion yclept Homœopathy, which has sprung

p like a upas in the land. As in all radical changes of systems, ıe mind tends to revolutionize to excess; so in medicine the ;ep was brief from the moderate changes which rational ractice commended to this monstrous dictum of Hahnemann, ıe father of homœopathy. The latest improvements in our rt demonstrate that a single small sized pellet moistened ith the decillionth part of the drug would have been fully dequate to perform the cure; nay, it is equally certain that ıe smelling of it would have sufficed! We here have the ey-note to homœopathy, and since it has become a ecognised power in the country, we will set forth a few reasons hich may help to explain the mystery of its success. There eing few subjects on which the popular mind is less informed han the vital one of medicine, nothing is more natural than hat it should fall an easy prey to the ingenious deceptions f quacks and empirics. Of this we need no stronger proof han the success of those advertisements and pamphlets in hich are contained a few plausible ideas couched in half-sci-ntific, half-popular language. In this way, no doubt, homœ-pathy has made rapid strides in public favor, especially hen advocated by the pens of a few able writers. 3ut this explanation does not suffice to account for the unde-iable good results which have flowed from the so-called homœ-pathic practice; and, "though," to use the words of Sir John Forbes, physician to the Queen's household, "it is melancholy o be forced to make admissions in favor of a system so ut-erly false and despicable as homœopathy, yet truth compels us to give it credit for what good it has done." Setting aside he healing effects of faith in a system, a common cause of ure in nervous complaints, we will perhaps discover the true solution of the problem in the fact that successful homœ-pathic practice is allopathy in disguise. Thus we frequently find employed by homœopaths such drugs as strychnine, atro-pine, morphine and quinine, the chief remedies used by regular practitioners, and surely this cannot be called legitimate homœopathic practice. Moreover they purge, blister, and administer emetics where the required indica-tions exist, and it is only when the obscurity or severity of the disease baffles their skill that they resort to the jugglery of their sect. The truth, therefore, touching homœopathy may thus be summed up: when the fraternity act in accordance with their avowed principles, they do no good; when positive good is accomplished by them, if the result be not due to the workings of an ardent imagination reposing implicit confi-

dence in their system, it is attributable to the intervention of what they call allopathic practice; and when by proper hygienic measures they prevent disease, they are entitled to credit for it, but not on sectarian grounds, for hygiene is neither of homœopathy nor of allopathy. Indeed the chief credit of homœopathy springs from its careful system of prophylaxis, and those who practice it deserve recommendation just as the physicians among the Chinese, who are paid while people are well, but are promptly dismissed on the advent of sickness. The success of homœopathy was a signal for a thousand other fallacies springing up in its wake, each succeeding one more monstrous than the former, till the following formidable array is exhibited by the New York Medical Register for 1864: "The whole number of persons professing to practice medicine in some form or other in the city of New York, at the present time, is 1,284:

Males	1,188
Females	46
Regular practitioners	643
Homœopaths	133
Advertisers	122
Known to be abortionists	52
Quack specialists	68
Undetermined	98

The remainder designate themselves "Analytical," "Botanic," "Magnetic," "Hygeio-Electropathists," "Electro-Chemical," "Metaphysical," "Eclectic," "Hydropathic," "Indian," "Pantological," "Clairvoyants," "Physopaths," "Medical Astrologists," &c. &c. Yet most of those impostors make money and drive fast horses; while many well-educated and industrious physicians eke out but a mere competence.

Although so long as ignorance will give countenance and support to heterodox systems of medicine we cannot hope to see the evil of quackery entirely extirpated, yet much that could have been done to render it abhorrent in the eyes of sensible persons has been left undone, owing to the supineness and apathy of the profession. The most effective weapon against ignorance and imposture would be the establishment of a higher standard of requirements in candidates for medical degrees, a more elevated tone in our medical schools, and a careful exclusion from them of persons who have disgraced their previous lives by unjustifiable practices. Raw country boys, smelling of the hoe and the rake,

those who have done nothing but jump counters since
y were as high as one, are not such as a few years
nt in a medical college can fit to be care-takers of the public
lth. We have but to glance at a few of the theses which
annually handed in by aspirants for medical degrees to
ness an exhibition of the profoundest ignorance of the
nciples of spelling and syntax, not to mention the higher
uisites of rhetoric. Then we sometimes see colleges be-
w diplomas on those who advertise or in some manner
eive the public. We have this moment before our minds
case of a man thoroughly ignorant both in speech and
nner, who obtained a diploma from one of our first col-
es, although before he began to study medicine he used to
the daily prints with shameless lies, professing to cure
worst cases of consumption. Now that he has received
cense to practice he riots in the most extravagant Mun-
usenisms, and invites the public to see a boy who had
en nothing for a fabulous length of time, and whom he
rescued from the grave. While such things continue
cannot but expect to find unmedical people fall into
ious errors concerning the true character of the medical
fession. There has been some talk among a few eminent
ysicians about remedying those evils; but whatever their
entions may be, their action is decidedly null.

Although ignorance and quackery thus beset the progress
legitimate medicine, yet enough has been accomplished
prove that its tendency is undoubtedly progressive.
ervation, unaided by the results of collateral sciences,
same species of observation which has been practised
m Hippocrates down, has brought to light within the last
y years many important facts which entirely escaped the
ention of the ancients. Physical examination may be con-
ered the most valuable help to diagnosis which pure ob-
vation has bestowed on modern medicine, and all the more
portant, as it leads to the detection of disease in those
ions of the body where disease most frequently has its
t. The older physicians, having been unable to penetrate
arcana of the system, confined their observations almost
irely to superficial changes. Their works, therefore, teem
th labored descriptions of the changes of skin, countenance,
lor, and configuration, which supervene on diseased con-
ions, but are entirely silent on the more significant changes
king place within. The cultivation of anatomy both
rbid and healthy first suggested the possibility of estab-

lishing a connection between the state of an internal organ and the character of the sound it gave forth. The French physician Laennec, therefore, gave *auscultation* as the result of enquiries thus suggested. By means of this diagnostic aid a skilful physician is now enabled to determine the exact aberration from the normal standard of those important organs the heart and the lungs. Unhappily, too many people know with what unerring accuracy an experienced doctor can tell them how far and in what way they are affected; what their chances are of longevity; what feelings, agreeable or disagreeable, they will experience in the course of their ailment, and this after a few moments' careful examination. Since Laennec's time *auscultation* has been successfully practised in diseases of the brain, and promises soon to reach such a degree of perfection that through it incipient deviations from the normal state of things in that organ will be readily detected. Midwifery also has profited by this improvement, for auscultation of the fœtal heart is looked on as an important means of determining the position of the fœtus *in utero*. Chemical tests rank next to physical examination, and may be considered an off-shoot of organic chemistry. By chemical tests the first inroads of that formidable disease, Bright's disease of the kidney, are detected, and if the progress of the disease can be at all arrested, it is when chemical reaction first discloses its presence. In medical jurisprudence, also, chemical tests are of exceeding value, for by their means traces of poison may be detected in the system, even a year after death, and a late celebrated poisoning case proves how infallible are their revelations. Lehmann and Liebig in Germany, and Regnault in France, have especially rendered organic chemistry available to medicine by having carefully noted the action of chemical agents on animal and vegetable tissues. But chemistry has contributed in another efficacious way to the advancement of medicine, by extracting the active principles of drugs from the crude material, thus giving compact and reliable remedies instead of dilute and uncertain ones. The termination *ine* suffixed to most of the drugs in use indicates the result of chemical extraction.

Organic chemistry lies at the root of the commonly received physiological doctrines of the present day. Before the habit of close analysis and a strict adherence to the inductive method had rejected mere names as insufficient to explain the phenomena of nature, the terms *vitalism* and *vital force* were greatly in vogue, and every event in the system was at

be explained by an appeal to the intervention of this mysious agent. When, however, the question arose as to at was this vital force, the difficulties all returned, and it s found that a mere name had been received for an exnation. Thus, as when Toricelli discovered that nature not abhor a vacuum, and that the maxim had been adopted a cloak to ignorance, many rejected vital force as a mere nent and strove to find an explanation of the facts of siology. The discoveries made in organic chemistry, and analogy between chemical processes and the operations of ure in the animal economy, suggested a chemical theory ligestion and secretion. Facts were found in entire acdance with surmises, and every step of the digestive pros can now be satisfactorily explained by chemistry. Yet re can be no doubt that life is more than a chemical pros, and that growth and assimilation take place in convention of the principles of organic chemistry. But the alist, from Paracelsus and Van Helmont down to Paine, not tell us how those mysterious processes of life are acnplished. If the chemical doctrine of physiology has ed to give an explanation of every function, at least credit lue to it for what it has done; nor is the attempt fair ich has been made to depreciate chemicalism because it failed to explain everything. At least it possesses the doubted advantage of having given an explanation which ts have confirmed, which is more than the *vox et preterea il* of vitalism. According to the vitalists, the same mysious agency which keeps together the chemically anagonistic elements of the animal fabric, presides over every ction and process of life. This view would be in accordce with analogy if there existed any means of discovering at this vital force is *in se*, whether it be a direct intervenn of supernatural power or some unknown agent of the tural order. But so long as nothing of this sort can be finitely known, it is only proper to accept what experience ches; and when we find in chemistry an adequate means of plaining certain physiological functions, we should not reit it because of its inadequacy to explain all.

These services bestowed on medical science by chemistry ve been the occasion of a more energetic prosecution of emical labors.

That which, however, gives character to modern medicine the attention it has bestowed on measures preventive of ease. It has been almost a proverb among the people

that doctors thrive on epidemics and circumstances pernicious to public health; and indeed, history teaches us that it has always been considered the proper mission of physicians to cure and not to prevent disease. Nor is this to be wondered at when we reflect that in past social conditions the influence of the physician was very limited, the exercise of his profession being confined to personal interviews with his patients. And physicians themselves gave color to this opinion by completely disregarding prevention as a thing that did not pay; and by looking on health as a lawyer would look on universal love, something exceedingly damaging to their business. We have the earliest testimony exhibiting this view of a physician's duties. Thus Xenophon represents Cambyses addressing his son Cyrus: "But, child, these men that you speak of are like menders of torn clothes, so when people are sick physicians cure them; but your care of health is to be of a nobler kind—to prevent the army's being sick is what you ought to take care of."*

No doubt, to one looking at the condition of the streets of New York and certain other large cities, it would occur that no thought was further from our legislators and prominent physicians than the adoption of proper sanitary measures for the prevention of disease. But on enquiry it will be found that the fault entirely lies with the politicians, whose nature inclines them to filth and corruption. When aided by the authorities, enlightened and philanthropic practice will accomplish incalculable good in this field, and the worth of a physician will be rated by his success in preventing diseases, rather than by his skill in curing them. Were all the drugs in the world destroyed, the loss would be but little felt if proper sanitary measures were adopted for preserving the health of the people, as then the indications for the use of drugs would be infinitely fewer. What is needed especially is, not the establishment of chemical laboratories where new extracts and drugs may be manufactured, but the infusion of a more enlightened sentiment into the lower classes of the population, that they may take precautionary measures, which would prevent more disease than all the drugs could ever cure. The plan of prevention, as synonymous with hygiene, is carried into the field of disease itself; and to-day many diseases are treated by fresh air, tonics, and stimulants, where a few years ago the most active medica-

* Cyclopædia, Book I., chap. vi.

tion would have been employed. This is especially the case with continued fevers, such as typhus and typhoid, which are now regularly treated by fresh air, stimulation, and tonics, instead of high temperature, close confinement, bleeding, and purging. In like manner, we no longer see the heroic treatment pursued in inflammation of the lungs, a disease which gave the widest scope for the use of the lancet and the most actively-depressing measure. The antiphlogistic superstition, a relic of the doctrine of vitalism and the entity of disease, is slowly yielding to the rational sentiment which sees in every disease an effort of nature towards recovery, and which strives to direct and assist that effort. This tendency to eliminate *physicking* from sound medicine gives to it more the character of a science acting in conformity with principles, than of an experiment which, resorting to a variety of expedients, hopes to hit the right one. But popular prejudice opposes the strongest barrier to this rational tendency of medicine, for when people are sick they will be *physicked*. It is this determination to swallow all the medicines within reach which supports charlatans, nostrum venders, and pill-makers; for when a conscientious physician has declared the impropriety or inutility of further medication, quacks, who hold out delusive hopes of a speedy and sure recovery, are visited and handsomely feed for their lies. This is disheartening to medical reformers, and yet cannot be remedied till a more enlightened sentiment is infused into the masses.

To prove that this fondness for constant and heavy dosing is a fatuity of the people and not the fault of the doctors, it has been frequently observed that nowhere is there so little medicine used as in a physician's own family.

What has chiefly contributed to simplify the practice of medicine and limit the use of drugs to a few leading chemical extracts, is the more perfect system of diagnosis created by physical examination, chemical tests, and the study of morbid anatomy. Effects are for the most part more numerous and more complex than causes, symptoms more varied than diseases; and the system of medicine which would treat mere symptoms or effects must have recourse to a more complicated and varied class of healing agents. For this reason we see a countless number of remedies employed by the ignorant, in whose eyes every symptom constitutes a distinct disease. But enlightened medicine strives to penetrate mere symptoms; it unmasks the actor which produces such strange phantasmagoria; it sinks a shaft into the well-

spring of the trouble, and finds why the water comes forth muddy. What a vast deal of ingenuity would have been wasted in New York a few years ago in attempts to purify, by chemical means, the Croton water impregnated with decayed vegetable matter, had not a practical wisdom suggested an enquiry into the condition of the Croton river, and removed the trouble by removing the dead leaves which caused it. So in medicine short-sighted practice deals with symptoms, using specifics for every symptom it encounters, while philosophical practice views them but as stepping-stones to the discovery of their cause; and this discovery made removes a whole legion of complicated effects by a few well-directed remedies. Not many years ago a physician would have ordered, in a case of simple dysentery, one remedy to allay pain, another to check restlessness, bleeding to bring down inflammation, calomel, perhaps, to the extent of salivating, and something different to meet every different symptom. But now how different is the case! Nature recommends rest and a recumbent posture in all enteric troubles, and this precept is enforced by a little opium; then nature is allowed to abate the violence of the inflammation herself, while art prudently refrains from obtruding itself on her admirable processes. It will be seen, then, that the change from excessive drugging to the comparatively do-nothing system of to-day is the logical sequence of a more philosophical view of disease. But while rational enquiry has thus dismissed symptoms from the tables of nosology, it has inserted new diseases which were either supposed to have no existence at all or were confounded with other forms. Thus an imperfect diagnosis told us generally of disease of the heart, without having been able to draw those fine distinguishing lines which now separate the various valvular diseases from hypertrophy, pericarditis, and fatty degeneration. So in disease of the lungs we recognise tubercle, bronchitis, gangrene, and emphysema, all which would have once been ranked under the general head of chronic pulmonary disease. The recognition of new diseases did not, however, entail a corresponding increase in the list of remedial agents; and it may be taken as a proof of the scientific character of modern medicine, that it has known how to resolve the cumbrous nosology of the past into a few leading principles, admitting the intervention of but a limited number of therapeutical agents. But it has been urged that this restriction to a limited range of remedies is the result of professional prejudice, since physicians

will give no countenance to improvements, supposed or real, unless they originate within the profession, or conformably to conditions prescribed by medical authority. Thus, it is claimed, many admirable remedies exist whose virtues and healing properties have been fully tested, and which, however, the profession will not recognise because they have not been introduced to public notice with the stamp of professional sanction. This is a poor subterfuge of quackery, by which the unthinking alone can be caught. Of course, whatever savors of empiricism and secrecy cannot be tolerated by an enlightened body of men, and it argues well for the character of the medical profession, that the most important discoveries become public property the moment they are made, and the only patent which guarantees to the discoverer the credit of his successful labors, is the spirit of fairness and honor which prevails among his professional brethren. It may be said that we are claiming too much for modern practice, and that history still attests the supremacy of the great medical names of the past. When no other standard existed by which the progress of medicine could be estimated than the success of individual labors, *names* shone conspicuous in the role of fame, and the celebrity of a few was considered synonymous with the general progress of the profession they represented. Now, however, medical discoveries are no longer the fruit of individual enquiries, but the result of numberless minds actively and incessantly working. We no longer look to the career of a single man to measure the results of medical practice, but to unerring and carefully compiled statistics, the reflex of the combined medical mind of the world. It is by means of statistical records, authenticated by irrefragable testimony, that modern medicine can vindicate for itself the advanced position to which it lays claim. There is not a well managed hospital in the world where accurate records are not kept of the rates of mortality as influenced by climate, temperament, disease, nativity, color, and mode of treatment. In this way the comparative merits of past and present practice have been fairly tested, and an argument possessed of the weight which the most unyielding logic can impart, the logic of facts, has decided in favor of the latter. This argument has proved that the mortality bills of eruptive fevers and of inflammation of the lungs, by far the most frequent outlets of human life, are far smaller than they were even twenty years ago. In like manner the statistical records of rheumatism show a decrease in the rate of mortal-

ity and suffering strikingly in contrast with the experience of the past. And here we have an instance of a very recen change in treatment, for rheumatism used to be considere unamenable to treatment a few years ago, but the late dis covery that it is due to an excess of *lithic* acid in the blood de termined the alkaline treatment now employed.

Inoculation, first with the natural virus and subsequentl with vaccine matter, has stayed the ravages of a disease whicl used to decimate whole kingdoms, and whose progress wa considered fearfully irresistible. True inoculation can scarce ly be referred to modern medicine, as we find traces of th practice at a very early date in the East, but the manner o its performance was so imperfect, and its mode of operatio in the system so little understood, that what was then knowi was practically but little available. Nor would inoculation a the best have afforded a sufficient safeguard against the in roads of small-pox, for the mortality bills were but little affected by its practice. It was not till the protective qualities of vac cine were discovered that this loathsome disease lost its horror and became harmless as a serpent robbed of its fangs. If it still sweeps destructively, over cities and towns the effects must be imputed to remissness on the part of the authorities, for experience has fully proved that vaccination, repeated at intervals of four or five years, affords infallible security against small-pox. In this way, again, does the contrast between present and past practice decide in favor of the former, and proves the decision by an appeal to statistics. And even if medicine has depended on the advancement of collateral sciences for its own developments, it has, in a measure, repaid the favor by furnishing to psychological science a light which has enabled it to make many and valuable discoveries. The study of the brain and nerves, the great sensorial system, has helped wonderfully to elucidate psychological problems which were but little understood by the ancients. Indeed, it can be readily conceived that the mind which is cognisable only by its operations, can be studied to much greater advantage when the media through which those operations take place are perfectly understood. So far the door to discovery in this direction has just been opened; but there is a prospect that a rich mine of truth will be discovered when time and study will permit. Thus medicine must be always changing, for the field of enquiry widens with every new discovery, and each succeeding discovery modifies the former. Many, therefore, who, claiming to be conservatives in politics, social

economy, and religion, wish to include medicine in the list of their immutable institutions, find the facts sadly in conflict with their views, for the essential law of medicine is change, and, with certain fluctuations, change for the better.

ART. VIII.—*Official Despatches and other Public Documents.*

OUR first impulse, as well as our first duty, on the present occasion, is to congratulate the country, North and South, on the restoration of peace and the Union; and our first wish is that the government will be magnanimous and generous, as it can so well afford to be. It is not necessary to evince any vindictive spirit; such a course would, on the contrary, be very injudicious; far from doing good, it would, sooner or later, be productive of evil consequences. Any remark of this kind would, we are sure, have been entirely superfluous, had it not been for the base conspiracy which resulted in the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, and the attempted assassination of Mr. Seward.

The most high-minded government that has ever existed could not feel otherwise than strongly incensed against the perpetrators of such atrocious crimes; and if one of the assassins can be said to have acted more brutally and fiend-like than the others, undoubtedly that one is he who struck the man already prostrated on the bed of sickness. That both assassins deserved death in the most ignominious and revolting form in which it can be inflicted by the laws of any civilized country, even their accomplices would hardly venture to deny.

Our readers are aware that we have never entertained any very high opinion of the intellectual capacities of Mr. Lincoln; but they are also aware that we have always regarded him as strictly honest, faithful to his trust, and kind and generous in his impulses. And as none admire the latter qualities, as well as the former, more than we, or set a higher value upon them, so certain it is that none more deeply deplored or more heartily regretted the untimely end of their possessor. Of Mr. Seward our estimate was indeed somewhat different; we had little admiration for his character in any form; but we have never for a moment entertained any feeling against him which would have prevented us from risking our life to save him from the hand of the assassin.

It is not necessary for us to dilate at this time on such foul and disgraceful crimes; none of our readers need be convinced that they are subversive of all law and order, and that their perpetrators should be dealt with accordingly. At the same time, we do not think that they ought to be tried by court-martial. In our opinion, it would be much more judicious, for various reasons, to hand them over to the civil tribunals. There is no good reason to believe that they would escape punishment if this were done; even the suspicion that they would does not merely imply a want of confidence in our judicial system; it also implies that the class of our citizens in the habit of acting as jurymen are, if not favorable to assassination, at least likely to find excuses for it in particular circumstances. The jury, it is true, might not agree as to the guilt of those of whose guilt there can really be no question; but another and another jury could be empanelled. We think this would not be necessary; we cannot believe that any man, wishing to maintain a character for honesty or truthfulness, no matter what his political sympathies might be, would refuse to agree to a verdict against the would-be assassin of Mr. Seward.

Did the war still continue, and that there was any prospect of success on the part of the rebels, it would then be different, and accordingly a different course would be allowable from that we should consider right now. But, assuming that it were possible for the assassins to escape, it would be better they should do so than that they should be executed in a manner which, when the moment of calm reflection came, would not be sanctioned by intelligent public opinion. If the object of criminal law were merely to make the malefactors feel that they had perpetrated crime, then the only question would be as to their guilt; it would be of secondary consequence what formalities were used in bringing them to punishment. But this is not the case. The primary object in the punishment of criminals is the salutary moral effect which it is expected to produce; but this effect is lost if the culprit has not had the advantage of being tried according to the laws of the country in which he has committed the crime. This view of the case will, we think, be the more readily assented to as correct, if it be borne in mind that even in time of war, when martial law is in full force, the proceedings of any particular court-martial may be declared null and void by the civil tribunals, in virtue of the same power by which martial law exists for the time being.

For other reasons as well as these we are glad to see that Jefferson Davis is to be tried by the civil courts. Could it be satisfactorily proved that he encouraged the assassins, or that he was instrumental in getting up the conspiracy against the lives of the principal members of the government, there would be no good reason why he should not be executed on being duly convicted, as well as the meanest of his accomplices; but thus far it does not seem that he is legally guilty in this respect. To show that he is even morally guilty in connection with the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, would require stronger evidence than has yet been obtained, so far as we are aware. Indeed, the mere fact that he has been given over to the civil tribunals for trial, while those already charged with belonging to the assassination conspiracy are on trial before a military tribunal, may, we think, be regarded as conclusive on this point. At all events, we think this much more likely than that the arch conspirator should be favored by the government.

Then if Jefferson Davis cannot be convicted of being directly instrumental in the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, we hold that he should not be punished capitally as the chief of the rebellion. That he deserves death for the untold miseries he has inflicted on the country, especially on his own followers, is beyond question; but it would not be in accordance with the law of nations, as interpreted by the ablest jurists, to execute the head of a rebellion which maintained itself so long, which fought successfully so many great battles, and to which belligerent rights were accorded by the greatest and most enlightened nations in Christendom. It is precisely to obviate extreme measures of this kind that belligerent rights are accorded by the law of nations. What the motive of any particular government may be in granting those rights is another question; the law assumes the motive to be good from the fact, however selfish it may be in reality.

Nothing could be gained by executing Jefferson Davis, if he were convicted to-morrow; such a course would, on the contrary, do much harm, as the experience of the world proves. His execution would make him a martyr; and whatever makes one a martyr serves the cause for which he has suffered. Even Cicero lived long enough to see that the cause of public justice and morality would have been better served had a milder course been pursued towards Catiline and his fellow conspirators; for those who had either

been indifferent to his cause when alive, or who regarde[illegible] him as a bad man, strewed his grave with flowers.* Cæsa[illegible] was looked upon as very profane and by no means loya[illegible] when he delivered his celebrated speech in the Roman sen[illegible]ate in favor of sparing the lives of the conspirators, on the ground that exile or some kindred punishment would reall[illegible] be greater than that of death; but the great captain raised his eloquent voice in that august assembly, not as a sympa[illegible]thizer with plunder and rapine, but as a philosopher, who could see the effect of acts apparently trifling in themselves on generations yet unborn.

For similar reasons we hold that Jefferson Davis should not be treated with any needless harshness,; there is no necessity for chaining an old man like him, surrounded by guards, in the casement of a fortress; we hope it is not true that he has been so chained, for, if it was needless, as we say, and yet done, it can be regarded in no other light than as wanton cruelty; even to insult a fallen foe is repugnant to every generous mind, since there are none so great and powerful but that they too may be captives depending on the caprice of their jailers.

That Jefferson Davis has acted the part of a traitor—nay, a base unscrupulous one—far be it from us to deny; but we are bound to admit, at the same time, not only that the civilized world would have regarded him as a great man had he succeeded, but there are many whose opinions are not to be despised who regard him in that light even now. The female apparel in which he has been captured is a legitimate subject of satire. All who choose to amuse themselves with it have a perfect right to do so; but there is no shame attached to it; any of those many acts of his which have led to bloodshed and robbery are far more shameful. Any one trying to make his escape in time of war has a right to use any disguise which he thinks will be likely to save him; his doing so is no more derogatory to him than would be any stratagem which a general may use to avoid or bring on an engagement. Peter the Great, of Russia, once disguised himself in the habit of a Swiss girl, to avoid falling into the hands of his enemies, the Swedes. No one thinks the

* Napoleon III., commenting on this in his Life of Cæsar, makes the following very just observations: "Cicéron croyait avoir detruit tout un parti; il se trompait: il n'avait fait que déjouer une conspiration et dégagner une grande cause des impruedents qui la compromettaient; la mort illégale des conjurés rehablita leur mémoire, &c."—*Histoire de Jules César*, liv. ii, chap. iii., p. 325.

s of the celebrated Lavalette because he availed himself his wife's dress to escape from prison; whereas the cumstance has rendered Madame Lavalette famous for all e.* The wife of Davis had just as good a right to save husband, if she could, as the wife of Lavalette. itor though the former was, let us honestly admit that would have been a far greater disgrace for his wife to e deserted him in his adversity than to have sought, as she , to save his life. We must not forget that she is an Amer- n lady; and are we to encourage our countrywomen be less faithful to their husbands than Frenchwomen? en let Jefferson Davis be dealt with for his real crimes, l not for what is no crime; and let Mrs. Davis not be le the subject of coarse ribaldry, because, if he betrayed country, she, as a true woman, would not betray him in hour of need and peril.

When there was any danger of the Republic, none were re in favor of its salvation than we. Every number of journal issued since the war commenced affords evidence his fact. Before any overt act had been committed by rebels, we endeavored to show, with as little offence as sible, what the consequences would be if they really mpted to dismember the nation. In proof of this we r to our article entitled "The Lessons of Revolutions," he number of this journal for March, 1861, the object of ich was to show what have been the special fruits of olutions. We will extract a passage or two from this, l also give some extracts from other articles of ours, to w that we have some claim to be heard in now counselling deration and clemency, even to the rebel chiefs. Refer-

---

* Let Edinburgh critics o'erwhelm with their praises
Their Madame de Staël, and their famed LaPinasse:
Like a meteor, at best, proud philosophy blazes,
And the fame of a wit is as brittle as glass:
But cheering the beam, and unfading the splendor
Of thy torch, Wedded Love! and it never has yet
Shone with lustre more holy, more pure, or more tender,
Than it shed on the name of the fair Lavalette.

Then fill high the wine cup, e'en virtue shall bless it,
And hallow the goblet which foams to her name;
The warm lip of Beauty shall piously press it,
And Hymen shall honor the pledge of her fame:
To the health of the Woman, who freedom, and life too,
Has risk'd for her Husband, we'll pay the just debt;
And hail with applauses the heroine and Wife too,
The constant, the noble, the fair Lavalette.—*Byron.*

ring to the fruits of revolutions, we made the following remarks:

"Sometimes, indeed, the latter have been good; they have been so in our case; but it was a peculiar one. The greatest of England's statesmen, and a large proportion of the English people, admitted the justice of our complaint against taxation without representation. Nay, it was known throughout the world that our ancestors were oppressed by a government three thousand miles distant. But had there been no oppression, they had a right to protest against being mere colonists as soon as they found that they were capable of governing themselves.

"*But we owe our present troubles to none of those causes.* The Southerner has been as much an American citizen as the Northerner. This was of course his right; it was no compliment—we merely state the fact for argument's sake. The citizen of Boston, Philadelphia, or New York had no privileges from the general government more than the citizen of Charleston, New Orleans, or Richmond. If one state had different laws from another, it was only by the will of its own people, who had a right to have the same repealed whenever they found them burdensome, or in any manner inconsistent with 'the greatest good of the greatest number.' In short, if any one section of the country *enjoyed more privileges from the general government than another it was the South.* * * *Oppression, then, is out of the question;* it has not been felt in any form South more than North of Mason and Dixon's line."

In showing that most attempts at revolution end disastrously we adduced the case of the Swiss cantons, which seceded from the rest of the republic in 1847, but were forced to return by the stronger arm of the federal government. After briefly stating the manner in which the secession of those cantons took place, we added the following observations: "This led to the immediate formation of the somewhat famous Sonderbund—a confederacy consisting of no less than seven cantons, the avowed object of which was to form a republic of their own. The Diet (federal government) was not frightened in the least. It first reasoned calmly with the seceders, telling them that their confederacy was a direct violation of the federal compact. The Sonderbund replied only by repeating its former threats. The Diet passed a resolution declaring the confederacy illegal. The Sonderbund passed a counter resolution, and in defiance of the constitution declared itself an independent government. The Diet had now either to acknowledge the new state of things, or vindicate its authority by the sword; but it did not hesitate for a day after it became evident that there was no other alternative. A formidable army was raised in a few weeks, which invaded the seceding cantons. The Sonderbund had made great preparations, and threatened to annihilate any federal army that would attempt to question

ts independence or violate its territory; but all the latter ad to do was to attack Friburg, Lucerne, and the Tessino, hen the new confederacy fell to pieces." This we intended s a friendly warning against the rash counsels which first hen seemed to prevail. Nor did we fail to make a distinction between the Southerners and the revolted Swiss; we dmitted that the former would make a very different resistnce from that of the latter, but insisted that the final result ould be essentially the same.

Before our next number appeared the rebellion had comenced in earnest. While journalists who now boast loudly f their superior loyalty, and who have enjoyed no inconsilerable amount of government patronage, alternately hined and exulted—wavered like a broken reed—asking hether after all it was not better to let the rebels withdraw n peace—we, who never got one penny of government patronge, and never asked one penny, nor its value, from the day he war commenced until it was ended, spoke of the situaion as follows:

"Under all circumstances war is a calamity as long as it lasts; but eace is not always a blessing. *It is never such when maintained or secured t the expense of national honor or national dismemberment. Nay, it is ather a curse—certainly a disgrace to those who sacrifice all for it.* We re all suffering more or less just now from the existing war. But how uch better is it that we should undergo privations for awhile *than that e should submit to see our noble Republic torn to pieces without raising a and to save it!* The government and the millions who sustain it have, herefore, reason rather to congratulate themselves that they did not hesiate to draw the sword when they saw that the enemies of the Union ere in earnest."*

This will show that we were in favor of no parleying with hose who would dismember the Republic. Because vigor nd severity were then necessary, we earnestly urged both; ow for the opposite reasons we urge moderation and clemncy. But as we may not yet have satisfied all that we have ome claim to be heard in the matter, we will turn to another rticle or two. Few have forgotten the effect of the Bull Run isaster and others that followed it; hundreds who made a reat display of their loyalty exclaimed ominously, "I told ou so!" In commenting on the same events we observed, in ur September number:† "We have but little to say on the ubject of the war on the present occasion; not that we are

* *National Quarterly Review* for June, 1861, art. "The Secession Rebellion; hy it must be put down."
† 1861.

a whit less sanguine now as to the result than we were three months ago. We expressed no opinion in our June number which any recent occurrences have altered; in other words, we have as much faith to-day in the stability of the United States government, and its ability to overcome its enemies and put down the rebellion, as we ever had."

When so many of our own people shook their heads and said that the Union was lost, it was to be expected that those who had long been jealous of our increasing power and prosperity would readily believe them. But that periodical having a well-deserved reputation for shrewdness and foresight should fall into the same error surprised us not a little, and we commented on their views accordingly, quoting them as curiosities. Still more curious, we think, must they now be regarded; we will therefore extract two or three passages, the very same we quoted in September, 1861. We do this all the more readily because we were accused at the time by some of the same journals of being far too sanguine.

The *Quarterly* (London) displayed its farsightedness and wisdom as follows: "No one can see so mighty a *ruin so suddenly achieved, without speculating on the causes of decay.* A bereaved family look upon a surgeon as very hardhearted if he wishes to dissect a patient *who has just died of some obscure disease*, and in the same way the Americans may think it pitiless of us to philosophize over the *coffin in which their beloved Union lies.*"* Our readers will remember that we were somewhat amused at the time with this quotation; but still more with the following: "It is a spectacle, (the downfall of the Republic,) which we should study deeply, for so striking a warning is rarely granted to a nation. If in spite of it we suffer the intrigues of politicians *to lure us into democracy*, we shall deserve our downfall, for we shall have perished by that wilful infatuation which no warning can dispel."† In commenting on these passages we showed that the *Quarterly* had made certain slight mistakes in its predictions on former occasions, so that everybody need not regard the Union as "in its coffin" merely because that journal did.

Blackwood took a somewhat similar view of the case, but avowed it saw no reason why any sympathy should be felt for a nation that commenced its existence only by setting itself up in opposition to British supremacy. Upon the whole, therefore, the critic thought it rather a good thing

* *Quarterly Review*, for July, 1861, art. "Democracy on its Trial." † Ib.

hat we should slaughter each other on a large scale; as a pecimen of the language used we copy the same passage we id nearly four years ago:

"It is impossible to blame the South for preparing to *maintain its ession*, or the North for *attempting to retain its privileges*. The hostile ttitude of the South *is a necessity;* but setting the dictates of natural eling aside, and speaking only of policy, the attitude of the North is idicious *only in one or two cases.—Blackwood's Magazine* for July, 1861, rt. "Disruption of the Union."

Another English journal, entitled the *National Review*, aid by a certain class to be peculiarly friendly to this ountry, regarded our downfall as equally certain, and was villing to bestow some pity on us. It commenced in July, 861, to speculate on the subject, as follows:

"When our last number issued from the press, a mighty catastrophe ung over the great Republic of the West, a catastrophe which many oped might be averted, and which nearly every one combined to depreate. We shared neither of these prevailing sentiments; we were satised that the menaced disruption was inevitable, and we even ventured to hink *it was desirable.*"—*National Review*, for July, art. "Civil War a America."

The critic then proceeds to show that the rebels had a erfect right to secede as they did. They were very bad eople he admitted in having slaves, and differing with Exeter Hall, but still they did a good thing in breaking up the Union, the same (as we remarked at the time) as the wife of Samson did in cutting off his locks, the source of his irresistible strength, and leaving him in the power of his enemies. After a good deal of logic, the reviewer had no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that "they (the Federal government) cannot compel the South to come into the Union."* Thus all the leading journals of England regarded the great Republic as a thing of the past; they held hat its resuscitation was impossible; and were of opinion hat, upon the whole, the catastrophe was rather fortunate for he world than otherwise.

In a similar spirit the Federal troops were charged with arbarity, both by the rebels and all who sympathized with hem at home and abroad. As a reply to these accusations ve published an article entitled "The Laws and Ethics of War," based on the works of Grotius, Puffendorf, Vattel, and Wheaton, and maintained that "no impartial, intelligent

National Review, for July, art. "Civil War in America."

observer could take a careful retrospect of this war since it first commenced at FortSumter, without being forced to admit that, so far as the Federal government is concerned, no war has ever been carried on in a less vindictive or more humane spirit. We gave ample proof, upon the other hand, that no similar statement could be made in regard to the mode of warfare of our censors. The rebels were consoled, it will be remembered, with the hope that the yellow fever alone would decimate our troops in the summer, and force them to withdraw from the South, while it afforded comparative immunity to the rebel troops.

In reply to those who would discourage enlistments as far as possible in this way, we prepared a careful article,* in which we showed from various authorities that the disease is a worse enemy to civilians than to soldiers; and subsequent experience has proved that in this also our views were correct. Thus it was that we published article after article, against the rebellion, and those who aided and encouraged it, from the day it commenced until the day it virtually ended.

In quoting the above extracts from English journals, however, our object is not to excite any feeling against England; we distinctly disclaim any such intention. It would be very wrong to hold either the British government or people responsible for what some British journal thought proper to say on the subject of our difficulties. But were the facts otherwise—had even the British government themselves made those comments—had we the clearest evidence that they wished our downfall, it would still be an unwise course to quarrel with them about it. There will always be rivalry and jealousy between nations, as there always have been; and it is but rarely, if ever, that the most warlike states have made war on each other merely because the citizens or subjects of one thought proper to make unfriendly criticisms on the other.

Far from desiring peace at any time, except on condition that the rebel states would return to the Union, we deprecated it as a calamity, because we felt an unwavering confidence in the final triumph of the Union. Hence it was that we concluded our article on the President's message in the number for December, 1864, with the wish that the rebels would accept the terms offered them, as follows:

"It seems to us that it would be their own interest, quite as much as that of the North, to put an end to the horrors of war, by simply laying

*Nat. Q. R., No. X.

down their arms, especially as there can be little doubt that they will have to do so eventually. Not, indeed, because they are wanting in courage or bravery; none could have displayed more heroism than they; but their resources in men and money—in all that is essential for carrying on a protracted war—being confessedly so much less than those of the North, *they must necessarily become exhausted in time*, and none can admit this without also admitting that the sooner they put an end to the war the better. Let us hope, for the sake of North and South alike, that the success of General Sherman now before Savannah may be such as to convince the bravest and most desperate that any further resistance to the *power of the inexhaustible and resolute North can only result in disaster and ruin to themselves.*"

We need adduce no more evidence in order to show that we have acted in strict accordance with the motto on our own titlepage; and if this be admitted, it must also be admitted that we are entitled to a voice in the question under consideration. Indeed, the course of President Johnson thus far may be regarded as sufficient proof that he is disposed to do what is right without being urged to do so by any one; and what is more, that he understands what is right. If we are correct in this impression, Jefferson Davis will neither be executed nor harshly treated, however much he has deserved both. The best way to deprive him of all power and influence is to grant him pretty nearly his own former request—that is, to let him alone; let him go to England, to France, or to any other country he may choose to select for his future residence. But we really do not believe that, if he were left at home, his influence could ever again do us the least harm. Those whom he has deceived and ruined detest or despise him too much to encounter any danger on his account in future. If, however, there are those in authority who think otherwise, or if our leading jurists do so, let him be confined in some of our fortresses, from which he cannot escape. Should this be the course finally decided upon, as we think most likely, it would not be well, for the reasons already mentioned, to treat him with any more harshness than is absolutely necessary to prevent his escape.

With regard to General Lee, whom present rumors represent as likely to be arrested and put on trial, we think that, however clearly guilty he has been in drawing his sword against the Republic, the manner in which he surrendered entitles him to his liberty. Had he been captured in the field of battle, he would have had a right to claim to be treated simply as a prisoner of war. This right we ourselves recognised in advance the very first year the war commenced, —that is, when we entered into stipulations with the rebels

for the exchange of prisoners. Had no belligerent rights been granted them by the leading powers of Europe, this fact alone would have been sufficient to entitle Lee, or any of the other rebel generals who have surrendered, to be considered at worst only as prisoners of war. If even a rebel is entitled to consideration on account of his bravery and skill as a commander, and the long and formidable resistance he has made, the claims of Lee in these respects are beyond question; we think that those who are most dissatisfied with the course which he has pursued, or who feel most resentment against him for the large amount of blood he has shed, would readily admit that he has proved himself the greatest captain of the age, with, perhaps, the sole exception of his conqueror, General Grant.

It will also be found on reflection, even by those who are most incensed against the rebels, that the less of their property that is confiscated the better. Next to capital punishment for political crimes, nothing is more odious than confiscation; nothing excites a stronger sympathy in favor of the sufferers. For this reason, even despots are rather shy of it. Be it remembered that it is the Machiavellian policy in one of its most revolting forms. "When you have conquered those whom you wish to retain in your power," says Machiavelli, "ruin them." Elsewhere he says, "Crush them to the earth; destroy them." Russia and Austria have, indeed, taken his advice but too literally, as the unhappy Poles and Venetians can tell; but even these despots have learned that, after all, it is best not to do all the mischief they can; that it is not well to exasperate even serfs beyond the bounds of endurance.

Still more injudicious would it be, if possible, to deprive the rebel states of their former rights by degrading them to the condition of territories. Although there are many who urge this at the present moment, we do not think there is any danger that it will be acted upon. A little reflection will show that it would flatly contradict what has been the avowed object of the war from the beginning on the part of the Federal government; namely, to force back the revolted states to their former position as members of the Union. Now that they have been forced back, would it be logical to deny that they belong to the Union? To do so would be a virtual recognition of dissolution. We do not indeed mean that the leaders of the rebellion should be permitted to exercise the rights of citizenship; we do not think that they

ought; but we think that all should who are included in the President's proclamation as receiving an amnesty, and we are much mistaken if they are not.

As for slavery, that must be regarded as forever abolished. This will be punishment enough for the rebels, and yet they will be better off ten years hence, with the exercise of ordinary prudence and good management, after paying for their labor, than if they had still held the poor negro in bondage. It is pleasant to observe that many, if not the majority, of themselves begin to regard the subject in this light. And what a wonderful revolution in thought, as well as in fact, in so brief a period! This alone would have shown that the war has not been in vain, had it not been productive of no other fruits. Yet it is premature to exult much in the abolition of slavery until we see what disposition the millions thus set free will make of themselves. It is to be hoped that they will prove themselves worthy of their freedom by honestly working for their bread. As soon as all the questions at which we have thus hurriedly glanced are settled, as we trust they will be before long, the Republic will commence a more brilliant, great, and prosperous career, and excite tenfold more jealousy, than ever among the most powerful nations; a jealousy which, we trust will ere long be as great a source of pride to the Southerner as to the Northerner.

ART. IX.—NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.

Lectures on the Science of Language, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, in February, March, April, and May, 1863. By MAX MÜLLER, M. A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; Correspondant de l'Institut de France. *Second series.* 12mo. pp. 622. London, 1865.

IT is a great pleasure to take up another volume by Max Müller, for we are always sure of finding him thoroughly at home in his subject, and we feel a confidence that what he says is well supported by facts. Besides being a profound scholar, he has the power of expressing himself in choice English, in an interesting style, in a way that we do not expect from a German. He exerts through his writings a species of magnetism, very rare in such scholars, which excites his readers to think and study on what he says. By this quality he is well fitted to become one of the leaders of English scholars, and the band of his disciples will continually increase.

The first series of lectures was devoted to showing the existence of the science of language, and the progress it had made, and to a statement of the relation of the various languages of the world to each other, and their possible common origin. In the present volume the author confines himself to the exposition of certain principles and facts as seen chiefly in English and its immediate congeners, both Romance and Teutonic. Two things are especially considered: the clothing of language, or sounds and words, and the inside of language, or the primary and earlier ideas that were expressed by it.

The analysis of sounds given by Max Müller is the most complete and exhaustive that we have ever met with. Both vowel and consonant sounds are classified according to their method of production, and copious wood-cuts are given, showing the exact position of the vocal organs in the utterance of each sound. These figures are drawn chiefly from actual inspection, and though in some cases a little exaggerated, show precisely the mode of producing each sound and their relations. We can easily see from these figures, and better yet by practising and observing our own mouths, the ways that letters change among different people. The smallest alteration in the position of the tongue varies the sound; the slightest approximation of the lower lip to the upper teeth will change a *th* into an *f*, as we see frequently in the word *nothing* pronounced by negroes as if *noffing*. Some persons and tribes find it impossible to distinguish between certain letters, either when they speak themselves or when they hear them. To the Hawaiians *k* and *t* are alike, and the ancestral tribes of the Greeks and Romans had the same difficulty about *q* or *k* and *p*. But phonetic decay is owing almost entirely to muscular relaxation; to disinclination to make the requisite effort to utter the sound—for the change is always towards the easier sound. Sometimes letters are inserted for *euphony*, as our grammars say, but rather for ease of utterance.

We were somewhat startled to find Mr. Müller an advocate of the system of phonetic spelling, and were inclined to think him rather hasty in his judgment. But further reflection, and a careful perusal of the authorities to which Müller refers, have led us to a revision of our own conservative ideas. We know that a word is only a sound, and that the printed or written word is only the symbol of that sound. At first it expressed that sound exactly, but from the various causes which have led us to speak fast and slur over half our words, they no longer do express the sound. In reality we have two languages, one of sound, and another for the eye, which are only partly coincident, and which are diverging further continually. The question with us is, Shall we retain an inconvenient and unphilosophical system for the sake of habit and some slight advantages? The chief of these is supposed to be the guide that we have to etymology, and Max Müller is charged with having refuted himself when he says that "sound etymology has nothing to do with sound." What he

means by this is plainly that similarity of sound is no test of an etymology, for we know that sounds have changed by fixed laws, and that in most cases a different sound is to be expected; but it is a sound after all. As far as regards the vowels, etymology would certainly be aided by their fixity. There is no doubt that at some time a reform will become an absolute necessity. We cannot consider such a thing impossible, for the Spaniards have adopted an orthographical reform, and a change is beginning in the spelling of German words, though not an authoritative one. Many nations have already changed their alphabet. These things show that reforms in printing and writing can be made.

On the subject of phonetics much that is valuable can be learned from savage tribes, whose language is now in the state that the language of the Aryan tribes once was. The dialects of the various Polynesian islands display the same peculiarities, in their mutual relations, that marked Sanscrit, Latin, Greek, and Teutonic. Variations in sound, phonetic laws, and most of the causes that can affect language are there seen in full play. In the case of language we must judge the past partly by the present. We must explain what has been done by what is taking place around us. The missionaries at remote stations are doing much for learning by reducing these various languages to writing, and Mr. Müller makes good use of their labors in illustrating his reasoning. Some of them, however, are of that school of philologists, who unfortunately have their headquarters at the Philological Society, who think that a few slight resemblances of any of these half-formed languages to those in modern use are a sufficient proof of paternity. Disregarding all considerations of dissimilarity of structure and of claim of languages, one man claims the Hawaiian to be the primitive tongue, just as another had claimed the Finnish to be the ancestor of the English. A few of these men seem as if actuated by a desire to overturn all the constructions of science, and bring back, as soon as possible, the reign of chaos. One, while confessing his ignorance of Sanscrit, writes a labored essay to prove that Sanscrit is of no use to the student of language. Another, Mr. Wedgwood, we hope has received his *coup de grace*, at least in one point. We refer especially to page 103, where his derivation of foul, filth, and fiend, from the interjection *faugh*, *pfui*, or *pooh*, is discussed.

Mr. Muller, again, urges the importance of a study of the roots of language, and elucidates the statements he had made in his former volume. The expression which he had used of *phonetic types* had occasioned some misconception, and in one lecture he shows the reality of such roots, and the probability that they were primarily used as words; that they were concrete before they became abstract. The necessity that the words of any language be reduced to roots is obvious before any speculations are indulged in with regard to their origin. At present it is better to drop all theories about the origin of language, and spend

all our energies in developing the facts from which we must reason. We really have no sound basis from which to argue, and until we have made one it is wiser to pass by such useless theorizing. After we have reduced every language that we know to its simple and primary elements, behind which we cannot go, we may begin to ask the cause and source of the elements themselves. The very process of developing the elements may furnish us a method for resolving the problem.

But it is to the latter part of this book that we wish to call special attention. In that the author discourses the first ideas in all languages, and those are the ideas of the superior powers of the deities. Men feeling their dependence on something higher than themselves, for their daily light at least, are early led to ideas and names for those higher personages who bestow on them these good things. To this subject of comparative mythology Mr. Müller brings much thought and much learning. It may, at first, be asked, what has mythology to do with language, and what has a book that professes to treat of words, letters, and sounds, to do with different ideas of the deity? But when we consider that mythology arises from language, when we reflect that similar myths and legends may be resolved into one by a proved identity in the names of the fabled persons; when we remember how often words are deified and made idols, how nations are ruled by an empty sound, how multitudes in America are swayed in their political actions by the mere name *Democracy*, we see at once the connection between philology and mythology. Mr. Müller, however, is not the first to connect the two. Dr. Kuhn, long ago, admitted mythology into his *Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Sprachforschung*, as part and parcel of that science.

The occasional correspondence of the stories of Greek and Roman mythology with the statements of the Bible was long ago noticed; such as of the flood of Deucalion and that of Noah, of the garden of the Hesperides and that of Eden, and such similarities were readily enough explained as distorted remembrances of early revelations and historic facts. Still later, similar traditions were attempted to be traced among many savage tribes, and the same explanation was given. After an impulse was given to the study of the old northern literature, the remarkable resemblance of the Scandinavian mythology to that of the Greeks and other Eastern nations was commented on. But the identity of origin of all these mythologies has only been argued and proved since the thorough study of Sanskrit and of comparative philology. Max Müller, in his *Essay on Comparative Mythology*, published in the Oxford Essays for 1856, and his follower, Mr. G. W. Cox, in his excellent paraphrases of the Grecian legends and tales, have before presented this subject to English readers, but this is the first essay of the kind which has been brought before the American public. As such it merits some attention.

There may be said to be three prevailing or well-pronounced theories

on this subject. One dates as far back as Euhemerus of Sicily, and endeavors to explain all the tales of gods and heroes, and of their wonderful deeds and achievements, by real or rather by supposed historic facts. Thus Heraclês was originally some brave and sturdy benefactor of some small province—a man who destroyed oppression and rooted out abuses—one whose memory was held in veneration by his country folk, till, in time, he became deified, and his achievements were magnified into great and supernatural performances. So with Theseus and other heroes, and so with even the twelve gods of Olympus. The *Nibelungen-lied* is a poem, of whose historic truth there was not the slightest doubt in many minds. The characters were identified with Teutonic princes and princesses of that epoch, who, strangely enough, agreed with the story not only in name but in action. But the same legend is given in the old Norse Eddas, and this tale of the Volsungs is in many respects coincident with the tale of Troy and the Trojan war. Were these old mythologic tales supposed to rest on historic foundations of fact, we should have the very strange circumstance that such similar actions occurred in scenes and amid peoples so diverse. This would be, to say the least, extremely difficult of explanation.

The second theory is that of Mr. Gladstone, as advanced in his *Homer and the Homeric age*. It is briefly this, that the Greek theogony was a distortion of primitive dogmatic revelation; that the Greeks originally had a revelation of true religion; that in time ages grew darker and more corrupt, and that revelation was overclouded with fiction and fable. The outlines of it were dimly preserved. The Trinity was kept in that of Trus, Poseidôn and Hades. Lêto stands in the place of the Virgin, and the attributes of Christ, the Redeemer, were divided between Apollo and Athênê. But this is evidently mere assumption, for it would require a more perfect revelation to have been made to the Greeks than was made to the Hebrews in their early times, for the idea of the Trinity or of a Redeemer is nowhere plainly set forth in the earlier sacred writings. It would require, too, a continuous moral deterioration among the Greeks. In proportion as their mythology waxed more fanciful and ornate, so should their moral state have become worse. But we have in reality the striking contrast of an advancing morality and a decaying theology. It was a mere clothing which did not fit to their religion.

Here, too, the speculations of Dr. Döllinger should be alluded to.* He does not suppose a dogmatic revelation to man, but he makes an equally groundless assumption that man had at first a knowledge of a pure and abstract divinity and religious worship, and that after he had lost this knowledge he was thrown on nature and so deified the powers and objects of nature. In the East he turned to Astrolatry, in the West to Geolatry. The

* The Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ.

Pantheon of Greece was a collection of these divinities, brought in from many nations in those early times, when the inhabitants of Greece emigrated from different countries and different races. Besides resting on an assumption, the arguments are historically weak. For men, too, to have deified the power of nature, they must have already forgotten the early significance of their names, and gained abstract ideas of divinity.

But does it not seem as if many of those old legends, such as of Heraclês and of Dêmêtêo, of Theseus of Perseus, and others, could be explained by some simple phrase, which was their germ? Thus, if people said, at a time when, conscious of their own life, they felt that everything else, too, had life, "The earth mourns for the dead summer, the summer is shut up in the prison of darkness," could not the story of the search after Persephone arise? Or else they said, "The moon (Selene) watches during the night the sleeping sun (Endymion.)" In Orpheus we see the sun mourning for his wife, the dawn, descending for her into the realm of darkness, and losing her again in the morning as he turned to gaze at her. In Heraclês, in Perseus, in Bellerophon, we see the sun toiling for others, a beneficent person, who accomplishes many wondrous works.

These thoughts bring us to the theory of Max Müller, and the only one capable of resolving all our difficulties. According to him, all these legends and myths arise from modes of speech which were natural and vivid when men believed in the life of all the physical objects they saw, in the physical animal life of the sun, the stars, and the earth. This is not personification and allegory, such as Mr. Grote supposes, but originated before such things were possible, before the power was abstracted from the thing. We still say, "The sun rises, the sun sets," without any mythology remaining in the phrase; but there was a time when the dawn and the sun were thought sentient beings, and to say "The dawn flies from the sun" conveyed a deeper meaning than now. There was a time when men were young; when they were almost astonished by the recurrence of daylight; when they could fear that the sun would not come again, and could ask, with tones of real anxiety, "Will our friend the dawn come back to us?" Compared to that one assertion that the sun must rise to-morrow, is, as the author well says, Titanic boldness. Until lately we have been without the record of any such time, but now we find in the hymns of the Rigveda the expressions of just that feeling in the ancient Aryan tribes. We see mythology as it was forming and growing. We find it, in its early simplicity, as wonder and love of the powers and objects of nature. From the Sanscrit hymns, too, we are able to explain the Greek and even the Northern myths through the aid of comparative philology. We can trace the names and the attributes back to their earliest source. Zeus is the same as Dyaus, Dyu, Sky, brightness; Daphne is the Sanscrit Dahanâ, the dawn, and we thus see how the sun wooed the dawn which always fled before his burning gaze. In Greek, Daphne was also the name of the laurel, pro-

bably from its blazing up quickly when fired, and therefore we find that Daphne was changed into a laurel tree.

It is remarkable how nearly all the myths cluster around the sun and the dawn. The great tragedy of nature, the nightly death of the sun, and its reappearance every morning, heralded by the dawn, who again, as the twilight, attends him as he disappears, is the burden of every tale. Zeus and Apollô, Heraclês and Theseus, Perseus and Bellerophon, and even, perhaps, Pavis, are all the sun. Sometimes he is the triumphant god; more often, one who is obliged, by a power he cannot resist, to serve the needs of mere mortals by performing great and unending tasks. Athênê, Aphrodite, Daphne, and even Helen, are only names for the dawn. The story of Kephalos and Prokies is only that of the sun and the dawn, the tale of Troy is only the assault of the solar forces on the citadels of the East. In northern regions, where the day is less prominent, but the severe alternations of the summer and winter are more astounding and engrossing, we hear of summer as a fair maiden shut up in some lonely castle, as a treasure buried in the earth, as a damsel restrained by the spells of the powers of darkness, waiting for her youthful deliverer. Brynhild is summer, as Signed is the sun that delivers her from the prison of winter. The sun is the youthful hero abandoning his first love, invulnerable in all but one place or one way, yet always doomed to die. Achilles, Meleagar, Sifrit, or Balder, the story is the same. Mr. Müller supposes that the attention of the early Aryan tribes was chiefly drawn to the bright powers, the sky, sun, or dawn, as things ever existing or springing up, as resistless, immortal and mysterious; and that they regarded storms, and clouds, and darkness, as their enemies and subjects, that were sure to be overthrown and overcome. A contrary opinion is propounded by Professor Kuhn, and held by Schwartz and others. They take a different point of view, and suppose the early people regarded those things which were permanent as mere natural events, and looked rather to the storms and accidental disturbances as the great and overruling powers. While regarding the explanation of Müller as in the main correct, and the Aryan myths as rather solar than meteorological, still we cannot identify all in that way, and we must except to the author's treatment of the myth of Hermes. To us the idea of wind explains more clearly the Homeric hymn and all the actions attributed to Hermes than does that of dawn or twilight. Accepting his derivation from the root *sar*, to go, and identifying Hermes with the Sanscrit Saramâ, though he is properly Sarameya, her son, the name of the runner, the hound of the gods, is more applicable to the wind than to the dawn. Though many of the epithets elsewhere in the Veda applied to the dawn proper are given to Saramâ, they are only those that are capable of being applied also to the wind,—not the storm of Professor Kuhn. The wind can play all those tricks that Hermes played Apollô, and the wind can be the messenger of the gods and the

conductor of dead souls. But whatever may be the real or attempted explanation of individual myths, it is evident that the key to them all has been found. The riddle has been solved, and the origin and contemporaneous existence in different races of the same and kindred tales are explained. The similarity of the tales, the identity of epithets and attributes, and in many cases the etymological unity of the names themselves, all point to the fact that each nation did not originate its mythology separately, but that all arose together in the Aryan mind before its breaking up and separation into different tribes, and its emigration to different seats.

The progress of knowledge made thus far points to something further. The common origin of the Aryan and Semitic branches of language has never been proved; but if it is, will it not be asked at once whether the Aryan myths originated before or after the separation of the two stocks. Or even before and without that, will not some bold scholar attempt to explain many of the relations of the Old Testament in this same way by mythological phrases? If Heraclês is identified with the sun, may not Samson be also? We allude to this to show the possible, and in the present temper of the age, probable, direction that the study of mythology may take, to show the importance of a right understanding of what is already proved and known. Theologians will find that the circle of sciences they are expected to know is enlarged by those of comparative philology and comparative mythology, and it will require a careful study of the subject to enable them to refute at once any unwarrantable assumptions or false deductions.

Circular and Catalogue of the Law School of the University of Albany for the years 1864–5. Albany, 1865.

It is not our habit to discuss the merits and demerits of educational institutions in our June number; but our law schools conclude their terms, and issue their catalogues, earlier than ordinary colleges or seminaries; and that of Albany is one of the few in whose progress all who are in favor of elevating the status of the legal profession in America are bound to take an interest. Its different departments are under the control of eminent jurists, whose system of instruction embraces the best features of the principal law schools of Europe. What is most characteristic of the Albany school may be inferred from the following extract from the catalogue:

"All the lectures are oral, and are expositions of legal principles with illustrations and applications. They are also accompanied by such references, hints, and suggestions as are deemed the best calculated to enable the mind the more thoroughly to master and retain them.

"The Faculty have, however, a higher aim than simply teaching young men the law. They will also use their best endeavor to teach those who are intending to enter the profession to be Lawyers. This is felt to be an arduous

nd difficult task. *It is training the mind to a right use of its own faculties. It is iving it a power over its own resources, and enabling it fully to avail itself of its own tores of knowledge.*"—p. 10.

The remarks we print in Italics embrace what should be the aim f all good colleges and academies; it is of comparatively little se to teach the student rules and principles, if he is not taught to arry them into practical effect. No matter how well stored the mind ay be with ideas and facts, in order to render them available, especially n speaking, it is necessary to practise the use of them. In other words, t is not sufficient for the law student, or the student of divinity, to *think*, owever profoundly he may do so; if he wants to excel, or even to succeed, n his profession, he must acquire a facility, by careful training, in giving ral expression to his thoughts. In short, the tongue requires to be rained as well as the fingers; it is because this fact is lost sight of that re find so many men eminent in literature and science, who are incapable f expressing the most ordinary ideas when called upon to speak. We nake room for one extract more:

"Another feature of importance is to be noticed in the MOOT COURTS. uestions or causes, previously given out, are here argued by four of the tudents. These questions and causes are either taken from, and designed to lustrate some vexed points arising in the lectures, or they are real causes ending before the Supreme Court, or Court of Appeals.

"Upon the conclusion of the argument, the cause is given to the class to iscuss and decide. This *gives rise to discussions of great interest and profit*, in which arge numbers of the class participate. After the discussion and decision by the lass, the presiding professor gives his views on the questions involved, and on he correctness or incorrectness of the decision. Two of these courts are held ach week. By judiciously pursuing this course, varied in such respects as ex-erience may suggest, it is confidently expected that the student may be essen-ially aided in his efforts to become *a ready, fluent, and correct extemporaneous peaker, and that he may also acquire good habits of speaking—learning never to sacrifice ense to sound, or solid argument to showy declamation.*"

Without the habit of discussing interesting topics, practised to a greater r less extent, there can be no fluent, correct speakers, not to mention rators. Why, then, is there so much dumb show at most of our col-eges? Why are not students taught to speak as well as to write? for that hey are not so notorious.

ART.

Catalogue of the Fortieth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design. New York, 1865.

We are very unwilling to find fault with the National Academy of Design; we would much rather praise it, if we could conscientiously do so. We have never been treated otherwise than courteously by any of its members; there is, in fact, no conceivable motive that we could have to speak of it in any other terms than those of approbation. But to praise ndiscriminately as excellent what rarely rises above mediocrity is not

the duty of a reviewer; nor is it the way to foster or aid the cause of art. On the contrary, its best friends are those who honestly tell the truth about it. It is therefore in no censorious spirit that we have examined the present exhibition of the Academy, but with every disposition to give ample credit wherever we conceived any credit to be due.

It afforded us sincere pleasure to learn some two years ago that our artists would soon have a building worthy of the progress made within the last twenty years in American art; and we were anxiously watchful for the appearance it would assume. But seldom have we been more signally disappointed. When the new building was first pointed out to us, we thought our friend merely meant to satirise our academicians by attributing to them that sort of taste which we might expect from one who attempted to rival Barnum's Museum, without having sufficient means to render the new structure as fantastic and tawdry as would be likely to please the class of persons who usually patronize such establishments.

We are aware that many journals have praised the building, and that they may be right and we wrong; but if the latter be the fact, then we have yet to learn what is taste and what is harmony in architecture. Those who designed the building seem to have supposed that if they made any imitation, however distant or vague, of an edifice regarded as classic, the public would be satisfied. That after which the Academy is modelled is the Doge's palace at Venice; but the imitation is little better than a caricature in miniature. The former combines grandeur with beauty, whereas the highest praise that can be bestowed upon the latter is, that there is that sort of fantastic prettiness about it which is so much admired by children and by maiden ladies of a certain age. Nor has the architect succeeded much better in consulting the convenience of the public or the advantage of the exhibitors. In this brief sketch we can only allude to the more prominent features, but more would be superfluous even if we had time and space to spare. We dismiss the building, therefore, for the present, only reminding our readers how suggestive it is, in spite of its profusion of diamonds and gaudy colors, of the epitaph on a certain architect, which runs somewhat as follows:

> "Lie heavy on him, earth, for he
> Laid many a *heavy load* on thee."

But a much more painful fact is, that the exhibition is so much like the building. In finding this we were again much disappointed, for we had hoped that all our artists would exert themselves better than they ever did before, in order to do honor to their new temple; we had also hoped that the war would have suggested subjects calculated to stimulate native genius to its highest development in the grand, the sublime, the pathetic, and the terrible. That there are noble works of art on exhibition in the Academy at present, and one or two sad and truth-

ful pictures of the ravages of war, far be it from us to deny; nor do any admire them more. We shall take pleasure in speaking of them accordingly, but they are too few—certainly not more than a dozen pieces. However unpleasant it is to say so, the large majority of paintings at present on the walls of our Academy are below mediocrity. Quite a large proportion do not deserve a place in any respectable exhibition, but reflect discredit on those who admitted them, because an Academy of Art, as well as an Academy of Literature or Science, should have a standard. If not, how is the visitor, who has received no culture in art, to distinguish the genuine from the meritricious, especially if the latter occupies a more prominent place and a more favorable position than the former?

Do not three-fourths of the visitors labor under this disadvantage? If this be the case, how is the public taste to be improved? Is it not more likely in many instances to be vitiated? And here we are reminded of the notorious favoritism of our so-called *National* Academy; although it is not other artists, native or foreign, the managers favor, but themselves. Because they call themselves academicians, their performances, however crude, must have the place of honor; whereas works of genuine merit must take their chance in some obscure corner, or be hung up so high that it requires a step-ladder to examine them. Sometimes, indeed, a good painting gets a good place, although its author is not an academician; but we are assured that in almost every instance of the kind he must be able to bring some influence to bear on one or more who are academicians. It is almost needless to say that as long as this state of things continues the taste of the metropolis will not be much improved; nor will real merit receive the encouragement which it deserves. It is true that there are several art galleries in New York, some of which contain excellent works; but we certainly do not allude to those print-shops whose owners call them "galleries" because they sometimes have a few tolerable paintings on exhibition among a considerable variety of performances not possessed of sufficient merit for a respectable signboard. An eminent Paris house had a branch establishment in this city for some years. This attained a well-merited reputation for encouraging art, while it admitted nothing to its gallery which was not above mediocrity. But it was not sustained, and was, therefore, dissolved some five years ago. The name was assumed, however, by another party, who has retained it since, but scarcely anything else that distinguished the spirited and intelligent gentlemen alluded to. There are, however, two or three picture galleries in New York which contain no spurious pieces; but these are sufficiently known to our readers to render it needless for us to step aside from our present duty to call particular attention to them.

One merit which we must allow the new Academy is, that it is well lighted by means of skylights. After passing through the different galleries, it occurred to us, that whatever faults may be laid to the charge of

those who arranged the exhibition, it cannot be said that they sought to prepossess and dazzle the public by placing the best works in the corridor, where they could be first seen and appear to the best advantage; but our appreciation of this was somewhat diminished when we found, on examination, that the somewhat incongruous collection thus favored are chiefly, if not exclusively, the productions of academicians. We have no disposition, however, to criticise them, since we could say little that would be agreeable of even the best in this department. Yet we have not overlooked Mr. Gifford's *Coming Storm*, nor Mr. Kensett's *Ullswater*, both of which we have heard much praised by amateurs. We do not regard either as an inferior work, but neither equals some former performances of its author. This is particularly true of Gifford's piece, which seems to us rather exaggerated. The dark, motionless mass, the intense red light, and the broad clouds are but roughly put together, and produce an effect too grotesque to be natural. Did we not know that the painter is capable of a much more finished work, we should pass it by, as we have scores of other pieces.

Mr. Whittridge's *Twilight on the Shawangunk Mountains*, No. 205, is of a different character. In this we find sublimity, beauty, and truth; although there is too much grey in the horizon. But the loftly trees, the broken masses of rock, the group of hunters preparing for their bivouac, and the faint glimmer from their fire are so finely depicted that we very cheerfully pass over minor defects. We confess we are not equally pleased with Mr. Church's *Twilight*, No. 810, though in general we admire his landscapes more than those of any of his rivals. His clouds in the present instance are too much like rocks, especially the white, or rather the yellow. The impending thunderstorm on the mountains is, however, so well depicted that it redeems the work as a whole, and entitles it to a respectable rank. But in our opinion the best landscape in the present collection is that entitled "Looking down the Yo Semite Valley, California," No. 436. Many criticise it as showy and ambitious; but in our view they are the showiness and ambition of genius, which in the artist as well as in the poet is always bold and daring. The towering cliffs are undoubtedly sublime; and the placid river with its brushwood margin, the stately trees, the green valley, the soft, luminous, tropical sky serve to render that sublimity more conspicuous, and at the same time afford an agreeable relief to the eye, after it has contemplated the beetling cliffs losing their vague outlines in the clouds.

Of "The Valley of Wyoming," No. 282, we must speak in very different terms; although we could wish that many other landscapes occupying prominent positions at the Academy were equal to it. It possesses abundant variety and extent, and is sufficiently green even for the Emerald Isle, but it is too suggestive of the rule and compass. The topography is no doubt very exact; all who have seen the valley would recognise it

on this canvas; but those who have not seen it would be reminded rather of a map than of a real valley.

Portraits always fill a large space in the Academy of Design, and perhaps more on the present occasion than ever. We cannot say, however, that we see any improvement in this department; although we have noted some three or four good specimens. Upon the whole the collection rather reminds us of that passage in one of Juvenal's satires,* in which the Aruspex Unbritius takes leave of the Eternal City, declaring that the only *arts* encouraged or rewarded there now were flattery and vice.

> "——Quando *artibus*, inquit, honestis
> Nullus in arbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum,
> Res hodie minor est, here quam fuit atque eadem cras
> Deteret exiguis aliquid."

It would, indeed, seem that the fortune of some of our artists is less to-day than it was yesterday, as the satirist expresses it; for were it otherwise, some of them would hardly choose the subjects they do. It is remarkable that among the several portraits of military men in the present exhibition, there is scarcely one even of the second or third rank, or who has ever been heard of beyond the circle of his own immediate friends. In one instance, we thought we saw at a distance, from the style of features, one of our victorious generals; but a glance at our catalogue informed us that the full length portrait alluded to is that of an officer of one of our militia regiments, who thought it quite far enough to go as far as Washington to the war.

There may be something in the history of "the late Peletiah Perit" which renders his portrait interesting, but it has but little intrinsic merit. We allude to it thus, in passing, only because we have seen much better productions from the easel of Mr. Thomas Hicks; although we should like to know what mean those large books and manuscripts? Was Mr. Perit an astronomer, or the president of a petroleum company?

As we have not the honor of knowing Ex-Governor E. D. Morgan, we cannot say how like or unlike him is Mr. Huntington's full, length portrait, No. 412, but if the former, his late excellency is rather a greasy looking personage. His face is made to look as if soap and water were scarce commodities in his neighborhood; nor is the appearance of his coat much more suggestive of that virtue which is said to be next to godliness. No such charge as this can be made against Mr. Boyle's portrait of Governor Gamble, of Missouri. The latter is rather too well shaved; his face looks as if it had just been washed and rubbed so hard with a coarse towel as to make it preternaturally red, although, perhaps, those deep tints were intended to harmonize with the theatrical attitude

*iii., 14.

in which his excellency stands, pointing at a sword as if it had once done brilliant service in his hand.

There are several portraits by G. P. A. Healy, each of which possesses merit in one form or other; but the best is far inferior as a work of art to his full length portrait of Hon. William C. Alexander, Ex-President of the Senate of New Jersey, and for some years past President of the Equitable Life Insurance Society of this city. Mr. Healy may well be proud of this portrait; not one did he produce, even when he was court painter to Louis Philippe, that has so strong a claim to be considered his *chef d'œuvre* as this. Mr. Alexander is dignified, thoughtful, and majestic enough to be an emperor, as all who have seen him preside in the senate of his native state can testify; and there is not one of those qualities which is not faithfully reproduced in Mr. Healy's portrait, with many others that are good and estimable.

We do not like his portrait of the Archbishop of New York so well; and yet there are few better in the whole collection. The features are well delineated; the complexion is natural; and the expression of the countenance such as becomes a learned and pious prelate; but, if the arms are not wanting in proportion, the left is undoubtedly defective in another way. Viewed at a distance, it seems to hang heavily, like a piece of wood. It is otherwise, however, with the archiepiscopal robes, which hang in graceful folds, and are marked by that half-sacerdotal, half-academic air, which, in our opinion, is most in accordance with the original design of those garments.

Mr. Stone is much less happy in his portrait of Cyrus W. Field, who, it seems, is still on the lookout for a little admiration. In his present position he looks a little too effeminate, also somewhat more modest than he really is; nor are these the only particulars in which he is extremely unlike the great Persian conqueror, to whom some of his admirers once compared him, though rather prematurely. This time he does not appear on the canvas as the guiding genius of the Atlantic telegraph; his attitude is more suggestive of the less romantic, but, probably, more suitable business of selling paper to the newspapers at a reduced price, with the understanding that he is to be requited for his generosity by a small sprig, now and then, from the laurel of fame, in the shape of an "appreciative notice."

There are about a score of other pieces, good, bad, and indifferent, of which we have taken notes, but we must pass them over for the present. It is worthy of remark that there are considerably fewer lady exhibitors in proportion than usual; and that the majority, even of these few, have evidently devoted a goodly portion of their time to other "subjects" than those they have painted. It is no doubt a very pleasant, laudable thing to paint babies and husbands in bright colors, but it is questionable, after all, whether it is not better and more womanly, upon the whole, to stay

at home with them, and take care of them, than to exhibit their counterfeits at the National Academy of Design, or anywhere else.

HISTORY.

Historical View of the American Revolution. By GEORGE WASHINGTON GREENE, author of Historical Studies, &c. 12mo. pp. 459. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1865.

ALTHOUGH we have found many things, both in the matter and style of this volume, which show room for improvement, we feel that we should be neither just nor candid did we not cordially recommend it as an important contribution to our historical literature. It consists of a series of twelve lectures read before the Lowell Institute of Boston, in 1863, and some of which were read at the Cooper Institute, New York, the same year. That the lectures embrace a wide field may be seen from the fact that they discuss, respectively, the Causes, the Phases, the Congress, Congress and State Governments, Finances, Diplomacy, the Army, Campaigns, Foreign Element, Martyrs, Prose Literature, and Poetical Literature, of the Revolution. We need hardly say that no intelligent, thoughtful person could fail to invest these subjects with interest; and that Prof. Greene possesses those qualities in a high degree, we cheerfully admit. In his lecture on "The Foreign Element in the Revolution," he is more liberal in doing justice to France, for the powerful aid she afforded, than any other American writer, although he by no means exaggerates the facts.

It is too often forgotten, in discussing the nature of the struggle between the colonies and the mother country, that the former had both the physical and moral support of one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of military powers in the world. The common impression is that, although we had many French officers in the American service, foremost among whom was Lafayette, we had not the advantage of the French nation as an ally; in other words, there are but few who seem to be aware that France declared war against England in our behalf, and that consequently the struggle of the latter was not merely one against her rebellious colonies, but very soon became also a struggle against France, who attacked her in Europe as well as in America, with all the vigor and intrepidity characteristic of that gallant nation.

There is no reason why this fact should be concealed; on the contrary, it is important that it should be known, so that it may put others on their guard. It will be remembered that none took more pains to ignore the aid rendered by France than the leaders of the late rebellion against the Union, especially before they commenced the war. Their chief argument was: "Our colonial forefathers, who were a mere handful,

were enabled to set the power of England at defiance, and establish their independence; why, then, should we doubt of success, who form a nation of upwards of ten millions?" There was not a word about the French until it was too late; thus the masses of the Southern people were deceived by concealing from them the facts of history, under the guise of patriotism.

Our revolutionary forefathers had given abundant proofs of their heroism, bravery, and patriotism, before they got any assistance from France, as a nation. This ought to satisfy us; nor should we think it in the least derogatory to our prestige that it should be known by the world, and, especially, by all sections of our own people, that it was not single-handed we were able to force so powerful a nation as England to acknowledge our independence. Fortunately, the results of the recent rebellion afford a sufficient lesson by themselves, without reference to the revolutionary struggle. The great Republic has satisfied, friends and foes alike, that those who seek its ruin can only expect to ruin themselves.

We do not take these remarks, or any of them, from Prof. Greene's lectures; we always give our own views, let the subject be what it may. When we use the thoughts of another we quote them as such, whether our object be to commend or condemn them, and accordingly we now proceed to give a few extracts from the volume before us. The lecturer shows how strong were the prejudices entertained against the countrymen of Lafayette, and which were the most cherished of all brought by the colonists from the mother country, adding the following remarks:

"But American statesmen well knew that in their unequal contest with the most powerful nation of Europe, France was their first, if not their only ally. They needed French arms. They needed French money. They might need French ships of war, and French soldiers. This reflection had led them to welcome, as a happy omen, the first appearance of military adventurers from France, and added not a little to the embarrassment of Congress when they became so numerous as to make it necessary to refuse their offers of service. Yet the minds of these statesmen were not free from the hereditary prejudices, as the conduct of John Adams and John Jay clearly showed, at a moment when all prejudice ought to have ceased: nor the minds of generals, and still less of inferior officers, as plainly appeared in the expedition against Rhode Island. What, then, could be expected—or rather, what was not to be feared—when well-dressed and well-paid French soldiers should be brought to serve side by side with the half-naked soldiers of America?

"To smooth these difficulties, to overcome these prejudices, to convert antipathy into confidence, and jealousy into an honorable and friendly emulation, was the first good office which Lafayette rendered his adopted country. His money gave him the means of doing many little acts of reasonable kindness, and he did them with a grace which doubled their value. His rank enabled him to assume a tone with his dissatisfied countrymen, which sometimes checked their arrogance, and often set bounds to their pretensions. A true Frenchman in impulse, chivalrous sense of honor, and liveliness of perception, he taught Americans to bear more readily with qualities which his example showed them might easily be united with the perseverance, the firmness of principle, and the soundness of judgment which they had been wont to set above all other qualities. The French alliance might have been gained without Lafayette;

but the harmony of feeling which made it practically available was, in a large measure, owing to the hold which Lafayette had taken upon the confidence and the affections of the American army and the American people.

"And but for him that alliance might have come too late. It is true that he came to us in defiance of his government, escaping in disguise the *lettre de cachet* which a ministry, alarmed and shocked at his disobedience, had issued against him. But it is no less true that the sympathetic enthusiasm of Paris was raised to the highest pitch by this display of a chivalrous daring, which Parisians prize so highly; and that the English court was fully persuaded that he had done nothing but what his own court approved. Thus the French government found itself strengthened at home for an open declaration, and stimulated from abroad by the increasing jealousy of its powerful rival. Lafayette's hand is almost as visible in the treaty of alliance as the hand of Franklin himself." —pp. 308–10.

This gives a fair view of the question, so far as it goes; it does justice to France. But at least four or five of the following pages should be read in connection with it, in order to understand the scope of the author's discussion. The professor is not equally liberal in dealing with other "foreign elements." "We know," he says, "that there were many foreigners among the common soldiers; *for we know that, on more than one occasion, when men were chosen for special service, special care was taken to employ none but natives*" (p. 282). It seems that had it not been for this our author would not have known that any foreigners but the French had entered our armies. He admits, indeed, that "there was a German legion; and (that) German and Irish names meet us constantly in the imperfect muster-rolls," &c.—"but we know, also, that then, as now, hundreds bore German and Irish names who had never seen Ireland or Germany," (pp. 282–3). From this it seems to follow that those who did see those countries and belong to them deserve blame from "the natives."

One Irishman is mentioned, as if intended to represent the part taken by his countrymen in general in our struggle; although he did not come to this country from Ireland, but from France, in whose army he had served thirty years, attaining the rank of colonel. "He was anxious," says the professor, "to become an American citizen, as he told the credulous Silas Deane; but still more anxious to become an American general, as Congress soon discovered" (p. 293). None but an Irishman would have been so selfish as this! Finally, after doing a great many horrible things, this Irish brigadier-general returned to France, "*leaving in American history a name second only to that of Benedict Arnold*," &c. (p. 296).

On examination, we find that the darkest features in the "treason" of Conway consisted in his having made some criticisms, in a private letter, on the generalship of Washington, giving the preference to that of General Gates; and even for this he made an humble apology to the Father of his Country. It is not even pretended that he ever attempted to betray the cause in which his sword had voluntarily been drawn, for love or money; yet we are told that he is "second only to Arnold." As no other Irishman is mentioned in the "Foreign Element," the inference is that the Amer-

can people of the present day may accept Conway as a fair specimen of the Irish of revolutionary times. Doubtless some learned professor of eighty or ninety years hence will discover that the Irish have been equally treasonable, unreliable, and insignificant in the great war just closed.

We are sorry to find such narrow-mindedness in the volume before us; it is not creditable to the author, nor to anybody else. As for the publishers, we entirely exculpate them from having any sympathy with "Know-nothingism," or any other illiberal or puerile exploded notion; for, of all our publishers, they are the most cosmopolitan in feeling and spirit, as well as the most judicious in their taste as public caterers.

We do not condemn the professor's book, however, because he sometimes makes observations and statements which show neither learning, wisdom, nor good taste. There is sufficient good in it to counterbalance these defects; quite enough, indeed, to render it worth a much higher price than the publishers ask for it; and we should admit the fact were its objectionable features even directed against ourselves personally. Probably no part of the book will be more generally read than the two lectures on the Literature of the Revolution; although we confess we do not like the style in which they are written. It seems to us rather inflated, somewhat too ambitious, and by no means faultless in its syntax. For too frequently he pays more attention to sound than sense. Thus, for example, in speaking of Alexander Hamilton, he says: "It seems strange to find a boy of seventeen writing with such evident familiarity about Grotius and Puffendorff, and urging home upon his antagonist the *unconscious accordance of his fundamental axioms* with the godless theory of Hobbes" (p. 385). Now, what is there so very remarkable in finding a boy of seventeen writing familiarly about Grotius and Puffendorff! We know boys of less than sixteen who write "with evident familiarity about" the differential and integral calculus, about organic chemistry, &c., and there were those who did so quite as long ago as the time of Hamilton, if not a little before.

On the same page, the professor says: "But the most important channel of Hamilton's influence as a writer from 1777 to 1781 was through Washington's official correspondence; in which it is as impossible to deny that he bore an important part as to deny that the similarity of tone and thought which *pervade* it from the beginning to the end of Washington's life, *prove* the importance of the part which he also took in the preparation of the documents that bear his signature" (p. 385). This sentence is, indeed, sadly defective; according to the elementary principles of the English language the noun *similarity* is the nominative to both the verbs marked in Italics, but both have the plural form, as if *similarity and thought* were the nominative, whereas *thought* is the object of the preposition understood after *tone*. But we have only to turn one leaf in order to find worse, as, for instance, where the author tells us that, "If

there was less of eloquence in the pulpit, there was fervor, earnestness, and fearless patriotism" (p. 387). Thus "fervor, earnestness, and patriotism" are made to agree, or rather to disagree, with the verb *was*. If the author be right, and we wrong, then it is proper to say *they was*.

All we mean by this, however, is that the author should be more careful than he is, both in his statements and in the structure of his language. If he would use fewer words, he would do much better. At the same time we must repeat that his book will repay a careful perusal, and that no one who takes any lively interest in American history should fail to read it. It is printed in large clear type, on good white paper, and neatly and substantially bound.

The Person of Christ, the Miracle of History, with a Reply to Strauss and Renan, and a collection of Testimonies of Unbelievers. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. 16mo. pp. 377. Boston: American Tract Society, 1865.

THERE is no Christian writer, no matter what sect he may belong to, who would not profit in his views of Christianity by a careful perusal of this little volume. Indeed, we know no other religious book of the same size which we could more unhesitatingly recommend for the family library; for what is promised in the titlepage is faithfully and successfully performed in the body of the work. Lest a translation might be supposed to misrepresent the views of those known to be infidels, the original language in which their opinions have been expressed is given in "The Person of Christ."

This is true of extracts given from Diderot, Rousseau, Napoleon I. Renan, &c., which form a feature in the book which is at once interesting and instructive. We have an extract from Hess's "Life of Jesus," in which Diderot is represented by a personal witness as having paid the following tribute to the sacred Scriptures, after he had taken part for some time, with several other infidels, in ridiculing Christianity: "A merveilles, messieurs," he says, "à merveilles, je ne connais personne en France ni ailleurs qui sache écrire et parler avec plus d'art et de talent. Cependant malgré tout le mal que nous avons dis, et sans doute avec beaucoup de raison, ce diable de livre, j'ose vous defier, tout sant que vous êtes, de faire un récit qui soit aussi simple, mais en même temps aussi sublime, aussi touchant, que le récit de la passion et de la mort de Jésus Christ, qui produise le même effet, qui fasse une sensation aussi forte, aussi généralement ressentie, et dont l'influence soit encore la même après tant de siècles."*

* For a wonder, gentlemen, for a wonder, I know nobody, either in France or anywhere else, who could write and speak with more art and talent. Notwithstanding all the bad things we have said, and no doubt with good reason, of this devil of a book, I defy you all—as many as are here—to prepare a tale so simple, and at the same time so sublime and touching, as the tale of the passion and death of Jesus Christ, &c.

The reader is also presented with the views of the most eminent Jewish writers, including Josephus, in order to show the profound reverence in which Jesus was held even by his enemies. All admit that he performed miracles, an admission which is also made by the principal Greek and Roman writers of the first five centuries after Christ. But the work must be read in order to be appreciated; nor must it be supposed that it is intended exclusively for the young. Indeed, there are passages in it which none but those who are well educated can thoroughly understand. This is true of the "Critical Notes," which contain quotations in Greek and Latin, as well as in French and German, and which are taken from the works of various writers, both Catholic and Protestant, the laudable object of the author being not to glorify any sect, but to prove that Jesus was really the Son of God.

Communication from the Governor, transmitting the Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of the Metropolitan Police; transmitted to the Legislature, January 9, 1865.

THE contents of this pamphlet are much more interesting than its title would imply. The commissioners do not make elaborate statements, but they present us startling and instructive facts; indeed, there are materials for an octavo volume in this slender brochure. Without such information as it embraces, no one can understand the science of government. No general description of New York and its inhabitants, however graphically and elegantly written, could give a more truthful and striking picture of our moral, religious, and social position than this report.

But in order that it may serve this purpose, it must be read thoughtfully; the results must be traced to their causes. The moralist or legislator who has no idea of repressing crime, save by punishment, is one only in name; nor can any one be called a philanthropist who will not take the trouble to enquire whether the votary of crime or vice has not been exposed to influences of which his worst acts may be regarded as the natural results. We trust we need hardly say we do not mean that this would justify him; but it would disarm the resentment which it is natural we should feel against those who injure us without cause, and consequently secure to the culprit a dispassionate sentence.

Yet we would have the enquiry made more with a view to the future than to the past; more for prevention than cure; bearing in mind that the chief brutalizers of the human race are ignorance and poverty, and that in general the latter is consequent on the former. But let us hear what is the experience of those who know our people best; for it seems to us that they relate it candidly and impartially. Did we see any reason for the contrary opinion, we should take no notice of their report, for it is but rarely, if ever, that any useful lesson is learned from prejudice and

ion. In referring to the various causes of crime, the commissioners
k of war and its consequences as follows:

"The state of war is the school of violence and crime. The fruits of its in-
ction exhibit themselves mainly in cities, and most of all, in the metropo-
It is observed that during the war there has been a marked tendency to
es of violence towards persons, and other crimes of the graver character,
e petty offences have not increased in proportion. Probably in no city in
civilised world, not the theatre of actual war, is human life so lightly
d and subjected to as great hazards from violence as in New York and
klyn. In no other such city does the machinery of criminal justice so
ally fail to restrain or punish serious and capital offences.
'This is a startling proposition, but it is seen and felt by all classes of pru-
and sober-minded people.
'There were arrested by the Metropolitan Police, for crimes of violence of
ious character in 1863 and 1864 respectively, as follows:

	1863.	1864.
donious assault	343	402
ssault on policemen	19	35
ttempt at rape	28	29
ssulting females in the street	33	38
urder	79	48
aiming	6	6
anslaughter	1	10
pe	21	34
reatening life	12	30
	537	742

A small portion of this mass of high crime has received the punishment
ided by the laws. The fault, if any exists, is somewhere beyond the power
e police.
During the year ending the 30th November, five members of the police
have met their deaths by violence from the hands of desperate ruffians,
numbers of whom infest the city."—p. 7.

fter giving the names of the policemen who have been the victims of violence, the commissioners make the following just and pertinent rvations:

This has occurred during the year which has not been marked by any
us riot or mob. The city of New York ought to be not only as healthy
attractive a residence as any city in the world, but it should be as safe for
persons and property; yet its property is fearfully menaced by fires and
ories; and persons are in startling peril from criminal violence. This
ntable state of things is due, in a great measure, *to a tardy and inefficient
inistration of justice*, aggravated by the existing state of war."—p. 8.

t is creditable to the commissioners that they have thus the boldness ll the truth, even in regard to those charged with the administration of ce; who, it is notorious, allow the guilty to escape rather than that should lose a few votes when they are again candidates for a seat on bench. Nor can it seem strange, on reflection, that they do so, since the class that furnish most criminals that are chiefly instrumental in ing them. There is no orderly citizen who will not agree with the missioners in the opinion that the dangerous and growing habit, on art of the vicious and ill-disposed, of carrying concealed weapons, it to be prevented, as far as possible, by suitable legislation:

Since the commencement of the civil war, the practice of carrying con-
d deadly weapons by the violent and vicious classes of the city, has

become common. The practice of taking human life on slight or no provocation, has fearfully increased. Affrays which, if the parties were not armed, would end in assault and batteries, are likely to result in murders or homicides, where deadly weapons are present.

"The five members of the police force who are mentioned as having been killed by violence, were all shot by pistols in the hands of ruffians whom they were attempting to arrest; and several of those who are reported as badly wounded were assaulted with fire-arms and knives and other deadly weapons.

"It would greatly conduce to the good order of society, and to the personal safety of the citizen if a law were passed rendering it a crime to carry concealed deadly weapons."—p. 12.

It is idle to expect that a city like New York, which now contains over a million of inhabitants, can be effectually protected from the consequences of riots without a disciplined force. It is much better for the ill-disposed themselves that such a force should be at hand; its moral effect alone would prevent many a riot. There can be no greater error than to urge that there should be no troops retained in a large city or its vicinity lest they should be regarded as menacing the citizens. Had there been only two or three military companies at hand when the riots of July, 1863, commenced, neither our peaceable citizens nor the rioters themselves would have sustained one-tenth the amount of injury they did; and we are, therefore, of opinion that the following suggestions deserve consideration:

"No city or municipality is secure against the occurrence of circumstances requiring a resort to the military power to suppress violent proceedings. The law recognises and provides for such exigencies even in the rural districts of the State. In the metropolitan district there are likely to be frequent occasions for resort to the military force. The process of notifying and mustering the militia is *quite too slow for such exigencies*, and is calculated to increase the excitement and panic incident to such occasions, and to aggravate the danger of collisions. Calling out the militia is attended with great expense. It is a serious interruption of the business avocations of the members of the corps. The citizen soldier ought to be relieved as far as is consistent with the public welfare, from the hard duty of using fire-arms upon a citizen mob. These and other considerations combine in support of the suggestion that a brigade of the police force, say 500 in number, (of the existing force) be organized in military form and instructed in the manual of arms, and in evolutions adapted to service in cities. This brigade to be used as a military force only under such grave circumstances as now authorize the board of police to call out the military of the district in aid of the civil authority. Such a force, well drilled, accustomed to act together, at all times ready for duty, capable of being called out without adding to the public excitement, and without the knowledge of the hostile parties, would, it is believed, be able to defeat or arrest in their inception violent attempts to disturb the peace of the city."—p. 10.

It seems to us that the only objection to this plan is that rioters are never so much afraid of the police, however well disciplined and armed, as they are of the military. We have seen the best disciplined and bravest police in the world forced to retire by the mob in more than one European city; whereas we have seen half the number of military restore order without the loss of a single life. And the same remarks which we apply to the police apply with really equal force to the militia; the rioters, when engaged in large bodies and strongly excited, do not fear the latter more than the former.

For our own part, we have never had much faith in a voluntary fire department for a large city, or indeed for any city worthy of the name; we have always been of opinion that it would be much cheaper, as well as safer, for the city to pay its firemen, and we have discussed the subject accordingly, from time to time, in different journals. We hold that the police commissioners ought to be good judges as to the relative merits of the two systems; they are decidedly in favor of the paid system, and the following are among the cogent reasons which they assign for coming to that conclusion:

"It will appear, by reference to the last report of the chief engineer of the fire department, that of the 3,960 members, over 1,000 report themselves as residing at the several engine houses; large numbers have no other home and no other employment than volunteer firemen. Such a course of life is fatal to the men and fearfully mischievous to society.

"Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Cincinnati formerly possessed five departments, organized on the voluntary principle. It is understood *that the rowdyism and violent practices fostered in these organizations became intolerable*, and led to the adoption of the paid system as the only remedy. The reports of the departments of these cities claim that a most valuable reform has resulted from the change.

"This city has experienced *the same evil in no small degree*, and would, no doubt, realise a like improvement from a similar change. Believing that the character of the department would be improved, its efficiency enlarged, and the public relieved of a *source of disorder and apprehension* by the measure, this board *urge the adoption of the pay system for firemen*, the substitution of steam engines for hand machines, and horses in place of men to move the apparatus."—p. 12.

We have reproduced this passage all the more cheerfully, because we see that some of our learned jurists have discovered that the new law abolishing the voluntary system and adop ting the paid system in its stead is unconstitutional. Nor can we say that we are surprised at the fact—nay, for the reasons already assigned, it is precisely what we had expected. That our firemen have exercised considerable influence at our elections is notorious; it is equally notorious that they are opposed to the new law—that is, they would prefer to work for nothing than get pay! It is easy to understand, then, that they will be very grateful to those learned jurists and patriots who have discovered that the old system cannot be discontinued without violating the constitution.

The Report of the Board of Surgeons, embraced in that of the Commissioners, contains many painful facts—facts which claim the earnest attention of every friend of humanity. Such is true, for example of the following:

"We have in the city of New York, at the present time, upwards of one million of inhabitants, of whom five hundred thousand live in tenement houses. Over fifteen thousand of this latter number dwell in cellars. The larger proportion of the five hundred thousand are subjected to the tender mercies of grasping landlords, and are forced, from poverty and want of legislative protection, to live under conditions productive of diseases of the gravest character. Huddled together like cattle, in apartments where ventilation is imperfect and frequently impossible, with but few facilities for ablution; surrounded by a vitiated atmosphere, and subjected to all nuisances of a large city, this class is condemned to a process of slow but inevitable poisoning."—p 48.

Lest any might be so skeptical as to question the truth of this, the surgeons give illustrative instances as follows:

"The cases in illustration will perhaps not be inappropriate. At No. 22 Roosevelt street is a house two stories high, 38 feet deep, 18 feet wide, and with an average of seven feet between joints. In this house there are now living five families, twenty-four persons, averaging three hundred and thirty-nine cubic feet per person. There are no windows in the rear, no sewer in the street. There is an open privy vault in the yard.

"At No. 17 Cherry street is a four story house, seven feet between floors. The house is sixteen feet wide, and contains at the present time forty-eight persons. Each one has but two hundred and eighty cubic feet. There is no ventilation except through the front windows. There is no sewer, and an open privy vault.

"At No. 293 West 33d street there are sixteen rooms and sixteen families—thirty-eight adults and twenty-two children. The sinks are all stopped; there is no water in the house; there is no sewerage and no privy conveniences, except open vaults not connected with the sewer. Over twenty cases of typhoid fever have occurred in this house within the last four months."

Now we think that those who are so much concerned for the spiritual condition of the heathen off in Africa and Asia, would do well to look at this state of affairs nearer home, and ask their own consciences, whether it would not be as pious, after all—as much in accordance with the principles of Christianity—to give their suffering neighbors a portion of the money sent so lavishly to those distant countries, in the shape of bibles and tracts. Far be it for us to undervalue the Scriptures; but the heathen cannot be forced to read them; whereas the wretched people above described would need no force, but would be grateful for the services rendered them.

The Report gives very full and apparently accurate tables of statistics. These teach useful lessons, and to those who would read them thoughtfully they are painfully eloquent. But we can only allude to them on the present occasion. We confess we had no idea that so large a portion of those arrested in this city are females. We transcribe one of the shortest of these tables and with it close our extracts.

TOTAL NUMBER OF ARRESTS IN EACH PRECINCT FOR THE YEAR ENDING OCTOBER 31st, 1864.

Precinct.	Males.	Fems.	Total.	Precinct.	Males.	Fems.	Total.
1	1,035	236	1,217	18	867	404	1,271
2	1,176	171	1,347	19	629	248	877
3	960	223	1,183	20	805	438	1,243
4	2,475	1,681	4,156	21	822	378	1,200
5	1,917	1,249	3,166	22	468	188	656
6	2,198	2,136	4,334	23	236	104	340
7	1,102	493	1,595	24	160	4	164
8	2,075	1,334	3,409	25	520	86	606
9	702	237	939	26	1,121	202	1,323
10	1,602	852	2,454	27	1,602	804	2,406
11	711	263	974	28	895	426	1,321
12	233	69	302	29	778	373	1,115
13	874	372	1,240	30	41	14	55
14	1,223	897	2,120	31	90	25	115
15	1,881	923	2,804	32	109	14	123
16	1,233	428	1,661	Different squads,	4,287	2,569	6,856
17	1,086	550	1,636	Detective squad,	360	87	447
Grand total					36,278	18,473	54,751

If the heathen, black or white, could only read and understand these gures, they might well tell us to look at home, and relieve our suffering llow Christians, before we busy ourselves with their spiritual affairs. 'ersonally we know nothing whatever of the police commissioners; they re as much strangers to us as if they lived in China. But whoever speaks he truth boldly and honestly in order to discourage vice, repress crime, nd relieve human misery, will always receive from us all the aid which it is in our power to give.

The Veto of Governor Fenton against the Bill in favor of the Manhattan Gas-light Company.

In commenting, in our last number, on the spirited protest of the Comptroller of New York against the new privileges sought to be bestowed on the Manhattan Gas Company, it will be remembered that we had little doubt that the latter would succeed, in their usual way, in inducing the legislature to give them all they wanted. Those having millions of money at their command, and disposed, like the monopolists alluded to, to spend a portion of it to gain their ends, are not likely to fail in securing a goodly number of votes. In alluding to certain operations of the monopolists, which we thought ought to be prevented by legislation, as similar operations are in European countries, we remarked that, "let a bill, bearing directly or indirectly on the subject of gas, be introduced either into the State Legislature or into Congress, and straightway the president of the Manhattan Company is off to the capital to act as lobby-member." We also observed: "That the Legislature would bestow a moment's attention on any bill having a tendency to conflict with the interests of the Manhattan Gas Company, would be *prima facie* evidence that it was a 'nuisance.'" Our journal containing these observations had scarcely been issued when our predictions in regard to the legislature were fulfilled. That is, the legislators at Albany imitated the example of the retiring New York Common Council of 1864; but Governor Fenton has restrained the former, as Comptroller Brennan had the latter. The following are the reasons assigned by the Governor for his veto; and it will be seen that they are sufficiently cogent and satisfactory:

"I am also constrained to withhold my approval of an act 'to amend section two of chapter 543 of the Laws of 1855, entitled, 'An Act to increase the capital stock of the Manhattan Gas Company of the city of New York.' This bill proposes to repeal, 'for a period of two years,' the clause of the act of 1855, which limits the charge the Manhattan Gas Company can make against the consumers of gas to a price not exceeding $2.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. *I do not find that any person solicited this act except the stockholders of the Manhattan Gas Company*, and the argument used in favor of this legislation is the alleged inadequateness of the compensation consequent upon the enhanced values of material and labor. If this declaration was justified by the facts, I should be as reluctant to admit its validity as in the parallel case presented by the plank-road companies of the State, the horse-railroad companies of the counties of Albany, Rensselaer and Erie, and by the New York Central Railroad Company. The general reasons, having reference to time and circumstances, which led me to

withhold my signature from the bills providing for the relief of these several corporations, are mainly applicable to this measure, and prevent my approval thereof. It is possible, even applied to this case, they would have still greater force, for the additional burden which would be authorized by *this act would fall upon many thousands, all of whom have been subjected to the same enhanced costs*, many of whom have made the same sacrifices to the necessities of the day, and *cannot well afford to pay the price now charged*, and must labor many weary hours by artificial light to gain even a subsistence. This latter class of persons constitutes, I suppose, a considerable portion of the consumers of the Manhattan Gas Company, and if that corporation was obliged, through causes which have alike affected almost every interest during the past four years, to supply light to them at the cost of production for a short period, it would not be a greater hardship than many of the pursuits of industry and the investments of capital have endured, and which have not obtained legislative relief. Is not this plea of non-remuneration applicable to its condition for a short period only? *While this bill has been before me for consideration, the price of one hundred and eighty dollars per share has been offered for the stock of this Company*, according to the report at the Stock Exchange in the city of New York. A company which can obtain a premium of *eighty per cent. on the par value of their stock must have had a gratifying past financial history, or a prospective prosperity*, even under the restrictions imposed by the Legislature of 1855. I cannot, therefore, consent to give my sanction to an act *to increase the pecuniary welfare of an organization* whose prosperity is thus substantially affirmed, and which so largely affects the mass of population in one of the necessaries as well as comforts of life."

This is creditable alike to the good sense and integrity of the governor. It is pleasant to have even two public officers who are proof against the temptations offered by unscrupulous wealth to betray public confidence and sacrifice the public interests. Let us hope that these two stern rebukes will prove a useful lesson to those unprincipled and heartless monopolists.

Cape Cod. By HENRY D. THOREAU, author of "A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers," "The Maine Words," &c., &c. 12mo. pp. 252. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1865.

WE have seldom read a book of sketches with more pleasure than this. It is fresh, graphic, and attractive; nor is the reader merely pleased in its perusal; he is also instructed; for the author intersperses even those of his sketches thrown off in most haste with interesting scraps culled from quaint works on biography, travels, natural history, &c. Thus, for example, in speaking of oysters, he gives brief extracts from different writers in support of the theory that they have no power of locomotion. He scarcely alludes to any place through which he passes, that has ever attracted the attention of any other writer, to which he does not apply an apt quotation. He does not merely tell us, in an off-hand, easy way, that a town or village was settled at a particular time; he also tells us who and what they were that settled it; and if there be anything remarkable their history, we are let into the secret in the same quiet, unostentatious way. Thoughtless persons seek to depreciate this kind of writing, because, as they say, it is not all original; forgetting that it often costs more time to find one of those extracts, brief as they are, than would be sufficient to write a dozen pages of the kind said to be "original," simply because it has nothing in it but the twaddle of the writer.

The great mistake is to be ignorant of the fact that they are really the most original writers who pay most deference to the opinions of others worthy of that distinction. Addison, Swift, Voltaire, Bayle, and Macaulay are never so eloquent as when they are commenting on some sentiment or opinion taken from another writer, and even when that writer is far inferior to themselves. We are glad to see so lively and successful a writer as Mr. Thoreau attempt to show that a book may be very pleasan and at the same time contain a good deal of information, vastly more pleasant than those inanities which pretend to do nothing more than amuse.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. *Tenth Annual Report of the Insurance Commissioners of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.* Part II. *Life Insurance.* Boston: 1865.

2. *Sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Insurance Department.* State of New York. Albany: 1865.

THERE is a good deal that is interesting in these reports; and not to a few, or to any one class, but to the public at large; since there are now scarcely any who have not to do with insurance in one form or other. Those who have not ships or cargoes to insure, have houses; those who have not houses, have furniture; those who have not furniture, have clothing, books, or paintings; and those who have not sufficient of any worldly goods to render it worth their while to insure them, have wives, children, or mothers, for whose benefit they want to insure their lives, if only for five hundred dollars.

Thus it is no longer only business men or wealthy men who are interested in insurance. Those who dislike business of all kinds, and even consider it degrading, are as ready to avail themselves of the benefits of insurance as the most experienced merchants. But precisely because this is the fact, the utmost caution is necessary in order to avoid imposition and fraud; for the simple reason that much as the numbers who secure policies in one department or another are increasing, those who want to issue such policies and get the premiums, are increasing in a still larger ratio. In other words, however great is the demand for insurance, the supply is still greater; and whenever this is the case in any business, some party must suffer.

If the supply of garments in the clothing market is larger than the demand, unprincipled tailors will be apt to use "shoddy," so that they may attract customers by selling cheaper than their rivals; and the probability is that they will succeed for a time, because, unfortunately, there are so large a portion of the public who have not sufficient understanding to see until imposed upon, even more than once, that a spurious article is not cheap at any price. But to be defrauded of the price of a coat, a pair of boots, or a hat, even for the twentieth time, is a small

matter compared to the loss sustained by being defrauded of the amount paid regularly for years—perhaps for the length of a whole life—to an insurance company. If, then, it would be better to pay thirty dollars for a coat to an honest tailor, than to pay only five dollars to the dishonest one, still better would it be to pay an honest and responsible insurance company one thousand dollars for a policy, than to pay one of the opposite character twenty dollars.

It was not until we had carefully weighed these facts that we undertook to discuss the subject of insurance in the *National Review*. Short as the time is since we commenced to do so, insurance was comparatively new in this country to the general public. What was known about it was, in general, favorable, because most of our companies were honest and reliable; and those of the opposite character were only beginning to be found out. Having studied the working of the system in the principal countries of Europe, become aware of the fraudulent practices of persons calling themselves underwriters, and witnessed some of the deplorable consequences of those practices, we thought we should do some good by putting the American public on its guard in time. Americans had, indeed, already suffered at the hands of fraudulent underwriters; but the instances of this kind were so few that the general public had full confidence in all our insurance companies. The organs and defenders of the speculators were, therefore, able to make a very plausible show of injured innocence on the part of their clients when we published our first articles on Insurance Quackery; and, of course, in proportion as they could make the speculators seem honest and honorable, they could make us seem either very ignorant or very malicious. They tried both in turn, and no doubt succeeded in the minds of a certain class.

But every succeeding Report of the insurance commissioners and superintendents of those States of the Union in which most business is done in insurance, adduces new evidence of the truth and accuracy of our statements; we have such in each of the reports now before us; evidence the legitimacy and force of which none can pretend to question. The commissioners of Massachusetts have labored under a difficulty somewhat similar to our own. They know that the grossest frauds are perpetrated under the name of insurance; they know also that it is difficult to make the public understand the fact, and accordingly they show from the best authorities what is the experience of England, on whose systems of insurance ours are modelled. "We have heretofore alluded," say the commissioners, "to the abuse of life insurance in the country where it originated, and in which alone it has approached anything like maturity. But never till now has it been possible to characterize that abuse as it deserves, *without seeming to contradict the best authority in regard to the facts*, and consequently without running the *risk of being discredited*. The examples, however astounding or atrocious, would be regarded as excep-

tional facts, &c."* The commissioners proceed to show that so extensive was the system of fraud practised in England that the Government found it necessary, as a protective measure, "to try a system of government life insurance, limited to policies of £100, for the benefit of the classes who have been most victimized by unfortunate or fraudulent institutions."†

On this attempt the commissioners make the following just comment: "In a country so jealous of government interference with private affairs as England, and with a government so little prone to occupy itself with the particular interests of its humbler classes, it must be *a popular evil of alarming dimensions* that could call forth such interference." After some further observations to the same purport, the commissioners give extracts from the speech of Mr. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in favor of the Government Insurance Act, with the remark that "its passages are *more germain to the subject in hand than anything we* (they) *could say.*' The first extract given from the Chancellor's speech is that in which he illustrates a fact which we stated nearly three years ago; namely, that it is much easier than is generally supposed to issue a large number of policies, and get money for them, without either capital or character on the part of those who do so. We can only make room for the following part of the passage given by the commissioners:

"If so, then fears of government competition are fears that need not be entertained in quarters where prudence and honesty prevail. But *prudence and honesty do not prevail in all quarters*; and to those who tell me that this is to be considered as standing in the category of common commercial business I would reply, 'Consider for a moment the peculiar nature of Life Assurance.' This is a business that presents the direct converse of ordinary commercial business. Ordinary commercial business, if legitimate, begins with a considerable investment of capital, and the profits follow, perhaps at a considerable distance. But here, on the contrary, you begin with receiving largely and your liabilities are postponed to a distant date. Now I dare say there are not many members of this House who know to what an extraordinary extent this is true, and, therefore, to what an extraordinary extent the public are dependent on the prudence, the high honor, and the character of those concerned in the management of these institutions. When an institution of this kind is founded, so far from having difficulties at the outset, that is the time of its glory and enjoyment. The money comes rolling in, and the claims are at a distance, almost beyond the horizon. In the first year of the society the premiums far exceed the death claims. This is also the case in the subsequent years. For how long a period does the House think that the premiums to be received are in excess of the death claims? For thirty-seven years. That is to say, you found an institution which ought to be a very gospel of prudence, and the balance of its liabilities is postponed for one full generation of men."—pp. li.lii.

Further on, the Chancellor remarks:

"The House will probably like to know the fugitive character of these institutions. I will quote, as my authority, a little publication issued by the 'Guardian,' one of the first-class offices. * * * Number of companies protected, 595; founded, 274; ceased to exist, 259; amalgamations, 12. I wish I could read to the House a chapter on amalgamations; these are subjects of almost romantic interest. (Hear.) Transfers of business, 161. I think I hear a cheer from the honorable and learned member for Wallingford (Mr. Malins)

* Tenth Am. Rep. of the Mass. Commrs. Part II., L. Ins., p. xlix. † Ib.

but what will he say when I read the next item—winding up in chancery, 67. The truth is, that it is a subject which has both a comic and a tragic side."—*Ins. Com. Report*, p. lii.

In speaking of the "amalgamations," which are also but too well known in this country, Mr. Gladstone remarks:

"Such were the terms upon which those amalgamations took place. That is an illustration of what you will probably say is no better than wholesale robbery. Nay, more, I will go a step further, and say that a great many of those proceedings are worse than wholesale robbery, and there are many persons who have never seen the inside of a gaol, and yet who had fitter be there than *many a rogue that has been convicted ten times over at the Old Bailey*.—p. lv.

It can hardly be pretended that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was actuated by vindictive feelings against the underwriters. During the same debate a speech was delivered by the member for Guildford, from which thee ommissioners give an extract. From this also we take the following passage:

"One or two persons started a Life Assurance and Annuity Society, and published a flattering prospectus inviting domestic servants to invest their savings. Funds flowed in, but the whole of the moneys were appropriated by the managers and directors, and when the limited field which they cultivated was exhausted there was nothing to pay the insurers. It then appeared that the promoters had hired twelve directors, and had given them names of great distinction—he would not mention the names lest he should insult honorable members present—but the best names in the city of London were represented to be on the board. Those names were of great value in the prospectus, and the persons who represented them, he believed, were retired school-masters with bald heads, powdered wigs, and every artifice to inspire confidence. The rate of payment by the rules was 5s. per head per day. Further, to insure a good personal appearance, coats, waistcoats, and trousers were supplied, and the directors were enjoined to wear expensive jewelry, such as diamond rings, which were also provided out of the funds, and for not wearing a ring the fine was 2s.6d. Ludicrous as it might appear these facts were proved over and over again, and hundreds, nay thousands, of poor persons were in this manner defrauded of their savings."—p. lvi.

That there are companies of this description in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, is a fact as certain as that there are mock auctioneers in Chatham street, and certain other localities in that neighborhood. We know three life companies in New York, for whose policy we would not give one dollar; yet none put on more sanctimonious airs. Two of them issue their magic documents from small rooms up stairs, the other from a basement; it is but rarely that more than one of the "officers" are present; but if inquired for, they are sure to be attending a meeting of the trustees, convened for the purpose of considering the percentage of dividends, which it would be advisable to issue at the proper time, consistently with the necessity of always keeping on hand a large surplus fund to meet extraordinary liabilities, such as occur during the prevalence of epidemics, &c.

None in the habit of glancing at our comments on insurance need be informed that we do not mean to attribute all the fraud to life companies; all other departments have companies equally unscrupulous; equally

ready to swindle on as large a scale as they can. But the fire and marine swindlers are much sooner found out than the life swindlers, for the obvious reason that those who insure with the latter can make no claim until they are dead, whereas, those who insure with the former, have a claim to make as soon as their ships, cargoes, residences, or stores, as the case may be, have met with the accidents against which they had been insured.

As the report of the superintendent for New York is not yet published, we should not have known it contains had that gentleman not been so polite as to favor us with some of the proof sheets. No one, indeed, is more willing to afford the press all necessary facilities to discuss the subject of insurance in all its bearings; and were he otherwise disposed, we would not say, as we now can, that Governor Fenton has acted judiciously in retaining him in office. We know no one better qualified for the position, although we think he is sometimes a little too enthusiastic, and not ill-natured enough to suspect fraud where it really exists. That he makes no attempt to conceal it when he believes it does exist, but, on the contrary, does not hesitate to expose it, we readily admit; but we are convinced that there are several companies which make a good figure in his Report that belong to the spurious class. Nor can we agree with him in his estimate of the resources and character of certain new companies; for we do not believe that more than two or three of them are worthy of the least confidence. But, although we are not quite so sanguine as he, we agree with him that considerable improvements have been made of late; what we mean by this will be better understood from the following remarks with which he commences his report for 1865:

"The solid foundations of our insurance companies are now being laid down deep and strong upon a broad basis, adequate to the transaction of a largely increased business in all departments, not only in the state, but throughout the nation. Our capitals are being increased; surpluses accumulated; incompetent officers displaced; our already numerous agencies are being largely extended and systematised; risks are criticised and carefully examined; the laws of chance, governing fires and other events insured against, are more deeply studied and carefully tabulated; and on every side we find increased ability, resources, and appliances for conducting the business or profession of underwriting."

The superintendent reports that there has been a considerable increase in the business generally during the past year; and this is a fact in which he cannot be contradicted. We quote a brief passage:

"The Fire premiums of the New York joint-stock companies increased from $10,181,030.52 in 1863, to $15,618,603.82 in 1864—the ratio being 53.4088, which is the highest ever known in the history of these corporations. The number of policies issued by New York Life Insurance companies increased from 20,757 in 1863, to 20,782 in 1864, and the amount insured from $140,628,427.10 to $194,819,324.45. The gross assets of all the New York companies, Fire, Marine and Life, increased during the year from $82,488,056.07 to $108,458,772.76." p. lxxvi.

We know several companies ourselves, Fire, Marine, and Life, whose

success during the past year has been almost incredible. The example that first presents itself to our memory as most remarkable is that of the Morris Fire and Inland Insurance Company, which is little more than a year in existence altogether, which commenced with a capital of only $200,000, but whose assets on the first of the present month amounted to $803,187. The secret of this unusual success is, that if the company is new, its officers rank among our most experienced and most accomplished underwriters, and what is, perhaps, better still, none enjoy, to a larger extent, the confidence of our business men. In proof of this, it is sufficient to say that it is the same officers who, in a few brief years, secured a position and prestige for the Columbian Marine Insurance Company, second to those of no similar institution in this country.

The United States Life Insurance Company has issued its fifth triennial dividend, which amounts to forty per cent. on the premiums of the three years ending March, 1865. The directors also announce an addition of twenty per cent. to the amount of all previous dividends and additions on policies in force at the same date, payable in cash, with the sums insured when the latter become due according to the charter. This is an encourging record for the policy-holders. The plan is the same as that of the old Equitable of London, which makes the insurance company perform the functions of a savings bank. Thus, the premiums paid to the United States are the same as deposits, the interest upon which may be drawn and replaced at pleasure. What is perhaps better than all, the officers of this company make no attempt to evade their liabilities, but pay promptly without putting the rightful claimant to any expense.

This is more than could be said of the Mutual Life, with all its high sounding pretensions; but perhaps the reason is, that if the policies of the latter do not afford entire immunity from death to their holders, they are at least said to possess the property of imparting a high degree of longevity. Yet the Mutual has lately been borrowing one or two of the peculiar features of the New York Life, although hitherto it has made but clumsy use of them. It may ultimately succeed in assimilating them, but in the meantime we are bound to remember that, however much we may boast of our own ideas, if we purloin those of others, and give prominence to them, while at the same time we seek to conceal their origin, the inference is that, at heart, we recognise their superiority. Still, it must be confessed that there is nothing strange in seeing the ideas of a *Franklin* stolen by one who has scarcely any ideas of his own.

So far as we are aware, the life company which has done most business in one month is the Equitable Life Insurance Society of New York. During the month of May last it insured lives to the amount of $112,200, and received $37,000 for its policies. The most successful of all the new life companies, either in this country or in England, is the Globe Mutual. It was only one year in existence at the beginning of the present month,

and it has issued 2,064 policies, for which it has received $25,656.18. The amount it has insured is $5,742,337, while it has only lost $2,000. Its expenses for the year have been about half those of the first years of companies in general; and its losses about one-ninth of the same. However, novices in insurances should not be deceived by this record; for although the company is new as such, its principal officers are veterans in the profession. We believe that Mr. Pliny Freeman, the President, is the oldest life underwriter in America; yet he is scarcely more accomplished than the Vice-President, Mr. R. G. Bloss; and be it remembered that in no profession can it be said that knowledge is power more emphatically than in life insurance.

It seems that all commissioners, superintendents, critics, policy-holders, &c., at home and abroad, concur in assigning to the New England Mutual Life the first rank for its reliability and integrity; nor have we any reason to doubt that they are perfectly right in doing so, but the contrary, for no company can boast more intelligent officers. We are glad to learn, therefore, that its business in this city has largely increased during the last five months.

But why will not Mr. Barnes inform the public that there are many New York companies, especially life companies, that are far from being successful. Several of them stand in need of having their own lives insured. Since it is admitted on all hands that corporations have no souls, it can hardly be said that the truth can make them blush. There can be no harm, therefore, in expressing some concern, in a friendly way, for the condition of such life companies as the North America, the Security, the Guardian, and the Washington. We fear it may be said of each of these, with but too much truth, that the world is not its friend, nor the world's law; that the world contains no law to make itself or its policy-holders rich. Supposing these four would amalgamate, combining their capital, stock, assets (?), furniture, blank forms, presidents, ledgers, day-books, &c., might they not make one tolerable company—one in which the public would have confidence? There are several fire and marine companies whose condition seems equally precarious, and which, we think, would do well to act on the same suggestion, or dissolve altogether; but we think that upon the whole it were better for all concerned that they would pursue the latter course.

Petroleum Journals and Documents, June, 1865.

Doubtless many thought that our sketches of the petroleum speculators and their prospects, in our March number, were grossly exaggerated, if not altogether erroneous; but where are all those inexhaustible wells now that yielded from fifty to five hundred gallons of oil per day? Has the warm weather dried them up? or will they only flow in war times, when cotton is scarce and shoddy plenty? Of about a thousand

companies, each of which was capable of enriching half our people only three months ago, we only see one that shows the least sign of genuine vitality. As this, therefore, may be regarded as a curiosity, we think it proper to say that we allude to the New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore Consolidated Petroleum Company. But the officers of this institution are neither visionaries nor boasters, but shrewd, honest, business men, who save the hay while the sun is up; and, besides, they have been fortunate in finding a new well that is now yielding one hundred barrels of oil per day. Perhaps the numerous other wells that have so suddenly and mysteriously refused to run, will resume operations as soon as the weather grows cool.

Nephotherapy: the new system for the treatment of Diseases of the Throat, &c., &c., &c. By Dr. BUNFORD LIGHTHILL. New York: Carleton, 1865.

THAT performances of this kind should exercise any influence, or excite any other feelings than those of contempt and scorn, is a sad commentary on our civilization. It consists of some crude odds and ends taken from different works got up in the interest of quackery. The whole affair is made to extend over some forty-four pages, about one third of which are blank. The "matter" is nothing more nor less than what the "Doctor" has published for months in the newspapers, in the form of advertisements; but however worthless and ungrammatical it is, the distinguished person whose name it bears, and who pretends to be the author of a half dozen other "works," is not capable of writing a single paragraph of it.

The latest improvement in the science of quackery is this contrivance of book-making. Mr. Quack thinks he must be an author if his specialty is only to cut corns, or cause the hair to wax luxuriant, or prevent it from growing grey, as the case may be; that is, whether he calls himself a chiropodist, a dermatologist, an oculist, an aurist, &c., &c., he must get up a book. But why not? He finds his account in it; it is not he that is to blame, after all, but those who are so stupid and credulous as to permit themselves to be swindled by such shallow, vulgar tricks.

1. *Merry Chimes: A Collection of Duets, Trios, and Sacred Pieces for Juvenile Classes, Public Schools and Seminaries;* to which are prefixed Elementary Instructions and Attractive Exercises. By L. O. EMERSON, author of "Golden Wreath," "Golden Harp," &c., &c.

2. *Eli: An Oratorio.* First performed at the Birmingham Musical Festival, August 29th, 1855. The Words selected and written by WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW. The Music composed by MICHAEL COSTA. Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co. 1865.

WHAT Ticknor & Fields are to American literature, Oliver Ditson & Company are to American music. The latter as well as the former stand at the head of their profession in this country, in all that is calculated to

inspire confidence in the merit of their publications. Nor do we admit this fact the less willingly because both belong not to New York, but to Boston, however much some of our enterprising neighbors may frown upon us for it. We do not pretend to be critical in music; it is one of the many things in regard to which our knowledge is limited. But we have good reason to believe that the two volumes before us are each excellent in its kind. The "Merry Chimes" contains a large variety of familiar and beautiful songs, suited for youth; the whole collection is admirably calculated to encourage the study of music, partly by the skill and taste with which the pieces have been selected, and partly by the clear and lucid instructions in the elementary part.

The *Eli* has a European fame. Indeed, there are but few oratorios that give more satisfaction to a religious audience. There is not so much sublimity or grandeur in it as in the oratorio of the Creation, but some think there is more tenderness, more pathos—in short, more piety. It contains many passages of exquisite sweetness and melody. This is true, for example, of "Woman, how long wilt thou?" "Hannah, why weepest thou?" and "O, ye Kindreds!" (chorus of Levites), in Part I, and of "Woe unto us!" "My mother, bless me," and "When shall I arise?" in Part II. Both volumes are tastefully gotten up, and correctly printed; in a word, they are in every respect such as we would confidently recommend to our friends.

Remember Me; or, The Holy Communion. By RAY PALMER. 12mo. pp. 102. Boston: The American Tract Society, 1865.

THERE is so little in this volume which is sectarian that we can hardly infer from it to what church the author belongs. We learn from the preface that he is a pastor of some church, but nothing further in regard to his peculiar theological views. How much more Christian-like it is to write or compile a book in this spirit than to fill it with denunciations and invectives against all who differ with the author. There is nothing more ill-judged than one of the latter kind; nothing more unchristian, since nothing is more contrary to the teachings of Christ than to seek to disseminate strife, or to revile those whose only alleged fault is that they entertain opinions different from our own. The object of the present volume is to show all in need of information on the subject how they should devote themselves to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and the author avails himself of poetry as well as prose, as a means of producing that feeling and condition of mind which the divines of nearly all churches hold to be necessary for that purpose.

The Charimeter, or Christian Man's Measure of Charity. New York; General Prot. Episcopal Sunday School Union, 1865.

WE think there is no Christian family which would not do well to have a copy of this simple chart hung up in some discreet corner of the

house; but in order that its usefulness may be appreciated it must be seen and examined. It shows by a graduated scale how we may be elevated by faith and good works from heartlessness and distrust to genuine Christian love.

Annual Report of Samuel Leiper Taylor, Librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, for the year, 1864. Philadelphia, 1865.

We are glad to learn from this report that this Historical Society of Pennsylvania is making considerable progress in the good work of establishing a library; in our opinion its efforts show that it deserves the aid of all who are capable of appreciating the value of historical research as a means of improving civilization and increasing human happiness.

THE

ATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XXII.

SEPTEMBER, 1865.

I.—1. *The Iliad of Homer, rendered into English Blank Verse.* By EDWARD EARL OF DERBY. In two vols. New York, 1865.

ΜΗΡΟΥ ἅπαντα: H. E. HOMERI *Opera Omnia, ex Recensione et cum notis* SAMUELIS CLARKII, S. T. P. Accessit varietas lectionum Ms. lips. Et Vratislav. et edd. Veterum. Cuba 10. Augusti Ernesti qui et suas notas adspersit. Lipsiæ libraria weidmannia G. Reimer. MDCCCXXIV.

THERE is no proposition more generally assented to, at the ent day, among literary men, than that it requires a poet anslate poetry. But many other qualifications are neces- in addition to poetic genius. It is almost superfluous ty that no one should attempt to translate a poem with- a perfect knowledge both of the original and of the uage into which it is sought to be rendered. But one be a good poet and an accomplished linguist, and yet to produce even a tolerable version of a work of such ishing variety as the Iliad. He may be entirely success- n the narrative part, the descriptive, the allegorical, the natic, or the oratorical, &c.; but in order to succeed in , he must not only be a universal genius, but he must have ue conception of the design of the author; he must be tainted with the manners and customs, laws and religion, ne age in which he wrote; in short, it is necessary that he w what was the public opinion of the people for whom poem was originally written. Nor is all this sufficient; e must be similarity of mental associations in order to luce similarity of expression.

These remarks apply with tenfold force to a translation a language which is no longer spoken. There are ty expressions both in the Iliad and Odyssey which were

pregnant with meaning to the Greeks of the time of Homer whose signification is now conjectural; numerous allusions which were at once beautiful and eloquent are utterly faded, or serve only to mislead the reader. Again, expressions which were dignified, graceful, or tender in the time of Homer now seem vulgar or ludicrous; and the same is true of many of the habits and customs which those expressions represent. Hence it is that so few scholars agree as to the meaning of particular lines and passages in Homer, and that every succeeding edition of the original text, whether issued at Leipsic, Paris, or London, contains "emendations;" although it is universally agreed that Homer is as superior to all other poets in clearness and lucidity as he is in beauty, sublimity, and attractiveness.

This is one reason why so many attempt to translate him; another is, that he is always true to nature, and that nature is the same everywhere and at all times. This seems plausible at first sight, but it is not correct in the sense in which it is applied. Let it first be borne in mind that there are more local allusions in Homer than in any other poet, because those who took part in the war on both sides, although chiefly Greeks and Trojans, were the subjects of different princes, and the citizens of different republics, each having laws and customs, as well as territories, of their own, and differing from all the rest as much as any European nationalty of the present day differs from another. Even their modes of warfare were different; some had made considerable progress in the arts and sciences, others but little; and those distinctions are fully, though briefly, exhibited by Homer.

Almost every state had its own peculiar mode of attack; its mode of encampment; its mode of retreat; its mode of ambuscade, &c., as well as its own peculiar weapons. Thus, for example, we are shown how the Thracians encamped in three lines, with their arms on the ground before them, and their chariots as a fortification on the outside.

Τῶ δὲ βάτην προτέρω διά τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα·
αἶψα δ' ἐπὶ Θρηκῶν ἀνδρῶν τέλος ἷξον ἰόντες.
Οἱ δ' εὗδον καμάτῳ ἀδδηκότες, ἔντεα δέ σφιν
καλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖσι χθονὶ κέκλιτο, εἰ κατὰ κόσμον,
τριστοιχί· παρὰ δέ σφιν ἑκάστῳ δίζυγες ἵπποι.
Ῥῆσος δ' ἐν μέσῳ, εὗδε, παρ' αἰτῷ δ' ὠκέες ἵπποι
ἐξ ἐπιδιφριάδος πυμάτης ἱμᾶσι δέδεντο.—

Il. x. 469 *et seq.*

Rang'd in three lines they view the prostrate band :
The horses yok'd beside each warrior stand ;
Their arms in order on the ground reclin'd.
Thro' the brown shade the fulgid weapons shin'd,
Amidst lay Rhesus stretched in sleep profound
And the white steeds behind his chariot bound.—*Pope.*

lor is it alone the military art of the time which is fully ibed in the Iliad. The poet is equally communicative nstructive in regard to agriculture, architecture, mechan- nusic, painting, sculpture, medicine, politics, &c., &c. ier describes the mode of ploughing with oxen,* with s,† and shows how the former did the work of the hers ;‡ he describes fishing by angling†† and by diving ;‖ unting of the wild boar,¶ the deer** and the lion ;†† he ibes a marble palace upon arches ;‡‡ and he shows how rs are placed, &c.§§ In short, he omits nothing that was cteristic of his time. It is needless, then, to say that rough knowledge of the Greek is necessary to under- l all these descriptions, especially as there are many of weapons of war, implements of husbandry, and other es, particularly these used in field sports and amuse- s, for which modern languages have no terms, because no longer exist.

Ve see from this that a poet may be abundantly lucid and in his own language and time, and yet be difficult to late. Nor will the second reason assigned by those who mbitious to translate Homer prove much more satisfac- when carefully examined ; namely, that nature is the everywhere, and at all times. The *laws* of nature are, d, always the same ; but it must be remembered that are never stationary. Their results must be different e stage of any particular process from what they are at ier ; thus, what is true of the acorn is not true of the nor what is true of the oak true of what it becomes in ipse of time when imbedded in the earth under certain tions.

iat a country once fertile and beautiful becomes sterile and htly is known to every intelligent person ; and who pretend that it awakens the same ideas in its altered which it did before that alteration took place ? It would unreasonable to pretend that a woman who is beautiful ovely at twenty, must be equally so at sixty or eighty. as natural to be old as it is to be young ; but this

03. † See x. 420, Pope's Translation. ‡ Ib xx. 520. ‡‡ Ib. xxiv., 107.
04. ¶ xvii. 814. ** xi. 595. †† 378. ‡‡ Ib. vi. 304. §§ xxiii. 826.

does not prevent the two conditions from being essentially different from each other, even in the same person. Nor is this all. Is not what is regarded as beautiful in one country held to be the reverse in another? The same remark applies with still more force to personal comfort and luxury. The passions and feelings of man are, indeed, very much alike in all countries; but the manner in which they are excited is very different. Even in the same country, can it be said that the language of sentiment is always the same? Is it not, on the contrary, constantly changing? Nay, how large a proportion of the words of our own language have ceased to express their original meaning? Those best acquainted with the localities and scenery described by Chaucer can no longer understand him without a glossary, or without making his language a particular study.

There are many other difficulties which we might mention as a barrier against a faithful translation of a work like the Iliad; but one must suffice for the present—we mean the inferior power of one language to reproduce what is beautiful, or sublime in another. The question then arises, Is our language equal to the Greek? No competent judge will pretend that it is, however much he may admire our own copious and vigorous tongue. But assuming that in general the Anglo-Saxon is not inferior in power to the language of Homer, it could hardly be urged that the former is as well adapted as the latter to the subject of the Iliad. It is not so free in its construction; the extensive use made by the Greek of the participle and the infinitive mood, and the various forms in which it employs both, give it a great advantage over all modern tongues, and over all the ancient, with the sole exception of the Sanscrit, which has many characteristics in common with the language of Homer. The large variety of prepositions in Greek which may be combined with the verb, or used separately, according as the poet requires to be more or less energetic and vigorous, the numerous constructions in which the partitive pronouns and articles may be used to avoid sameness, and the remarkable copiousness of its adverbs and adverbial phrases, not to mention its compound words, render the Greek so admirably adapted to the exigencies of the epic that many eminent critics are of opinion that even Homer may be said to owe much of his success to those advantages.

If these facts are assented to, it can hardly be regarded as a reflection on the labors even of the most successful of

se who have attempted a translation of Homer to say that has never yet been faithfully translated into English.* e's Homer is undoubtedly the most agreeable and most ical work; but it can hardly be called a translation. The ion of Chapman is the most Homeric, but it is too often ting in the simplicity, grace, and dignity of the original. next to this is the version of Cowper, which is more literal that of Chapman, but less poetical as well as less Ho-c. Here are three poets of undoubted genius; it may estioned whether Chapman did not possess as much of rue poetic spirit as either Pope or Cowper, although he, e them, is known only by his translation of Homer. It mitted that none of the three poets has succeeded in g a satisfactory version of the Iliad, yet others who are ets at all have undertaken the same task with few, if of the additional qualifications we have mentioned.

We have no disposition to disparage the version of Lord y; on the contrary, we wish to do it ample justice. We ld like to see other distinguished persons devote their re hours to similar efforts; nay, we would do all in our er to encourage them to do so, for, even though they ld signally fail, their example would exercise a salutary ence on the republic of letters. But it were much ter that they would first try an easier work than the test the human mind has produced. We are sorry, for own sake, as well as that of classical literature, that Lord by did not pursue this course. Had he attempted a ver- of two or three of the principal tragedies of Sophocles, Euripides, or even of Æschylus, he would have done e credit to himself and more service to the public than he by his version of Homer, which, we are sorry to say, is of the worst that has yet appeared, if, indeed, any inferior slation has ever been printed.

Those of Macpherson, Ogilby, Hobbes, Shadwell, Mumford, others have, indeed, faults enough; but the feeblest and t lifeless of them has beauties which are not equalled by

---

The French claim that theirs is the most expressive of all modern lan-es; but even they admit that among their many translations of Homer is not one that does him justice. "Mais loasque ensuite," says Laharpe, ssai de cette espece d'extase, au desir si naturel *de communiquer l'impression avais reçue*, à ceux qui devaient m'entendre, et qui ne pouvaient entendre ere, *je songeai avec douleur qu'aucune des traductions que nous avons, quel qu'en mérite*, que je suis loin de vouloir diminuer, *ne pouvait justifier à vos yeux ni presser en vous ce que j'avais ressenti*, et je souhaitai, du fond du cœur, qu'il ît quelque jour un poëte capable de vous montrer Homere comme on vous ntré Virgile.—*Cours de Littérature*, vol. i., pp. 229–30.

anything in Lord Derby's version; so that, if the latter produce any effect on the character of Homer, it will be to lower his fame. None who read it without comparing it with any other, or with the original, could be persuaded that the original author is the Prince of poets; nay, indeed few would believe, under such circumstances, that he was a genuine poet at all.

That his lordship is entirely deficient of the poetic spirit is painfully evident throughout the volumes before us; and if he has any real pretensions to Greek scholarship, we have no proof of the fact from the beginning to the end of his Iliad. Not a single note, philological, geographical, biographical, or even chronological, does he give us; he has not a single word to say on any passage whatever. The sublime, the pathetic, the grand, the tender, or the beautiful, elicits no remark from him; no seeming chasm, incongruity, or interpolation receives any explanation at his hands. Pope was accused of having attempted to translate Homer without having any adequate knowledge of Greek; but his copious notes are of more value than the translations of many others, for he has ingenious, instructive, and interesting observations to make on every remarkable passage. Nor does he content himself with merely giving us his own views; he frequently shows how others have thought and written on the same subject, leaving the reader to give the preference to such opinions as he thinks best. It is chiefly for the same reason that the French version of Madame Dacier is so highly esteemed, although there is no English translation except Cowper's which is so faithful to the original. Even Mumford, supposed to be the least learned of all the recent translators of Homer, has given us some excellent notes, and many of them are of such a character that they could not have been written without a knowledge of the genius of the Greek language; whereas the truth is that there is not a line in the two portly volumes before us which could not have been written with the aid of other translations without the least acquaintance with the original.

But we do not wish our readers to accept our estimate or opinion of any work if we cannot show that it is founded in truth and justice. Before we give any specimen of lord Derby's translation, let us enquire briefly what his lordship had done before he undertook it from which the public has any reason to expect that he would succeed in a literary work of such magnitude, one in which so many authors, emi-

successful in other departments, had failed. Did he
:e anything above mediocrity even in prose? His
st admirers cannot pretend that he did. He had,
, established a good reputation as a parliamentary
r; if not an eloquent orator, he is at least a fluent and
re speaker. We have ourselves heard his speeches in
ouses of parliament, and few have pleased us better.
eerfully admit, also, that he has many of the qualities
atesman; nor do we know anything in his private
ter which, in our opinion, ought to prejudice any
gainst him. But need we say that one may be both
tor and a statesman of the first rank, an excellent
writer, and a most agreeable companion and friend,
t be but an indifferent translator of Homer? Be this
ay, no one who has undertaken the task has more
y reminded us of the well-known couplet of Denham
is lordship:

"Such is our pride, our folly, or our fate,
That few, but those who cannot write, translate."

Homer is not so easily translated, as many pretend,
e he is always natural and unaffected, it is not the less
iat those qualities enable us to form a more accurate
te of any translation of his works than would be other-
ossible. It is often said that public taste is change-
that what are deemed beauties now, may be regarded
cts in a few years hence; nor can the fact be denied.
is false taste that is thus variable; cultivated taste is
ntially the same in all ages and countries. Hence it is,
hile a particular author may be enthusiastically admired
country or age, he may be despised in another. Every
ened nation has its own favorite author, and wonders
e is not equally a favorite with others. In proportion
ossesses genius and is true to nature, he is admired by
ers. But be it remembered that even the great
peare commands but a moderate share of admiration
r countries, for he is very different in French, Italian,
man, from what he is in English. Let those who are
ng to admit this bear in mind how little Goethe is read
country, although his own countrymen admire him
as much as we do Shakespeare. The same remark
e applied with still more force to Corneille and
e, Camœns and De Vega. Nay, how few are there
us who read even Dante or Tasso?

All these are admired by their own countrymen, much more, however, in one age than in another; but Homer has been admired in all countries and in all ages. Those who agree in nothing else are unanimous in regarding him as the Prince of poets, and accordingly his works are received as models in the highest educational institutions of all countries. As the cause of truth as well as education requires that taste should be considered not as a thing capable of changing with the moon, but as the result of unalterable laws—a principle as unchangeable as truth itself—we may remark in passing that there is similar unanimity in regard to Demosthenes as an orator, Thucydides as an historian, and Longinus as a critic.

Nor is this universality of appreciation confined to poetry, history, and oratory; it applies with equal force to the fine arts, including architecture. Thus, however much the Italians, the French, the English, and the Germans have differed during the last thousand years on what constitutes beauty in art or architecture, all are *d'accord* in regarding the specimens left us by the artists of Greece—sadly mutilated as they are in most cases, and tarnished by the dust of more than a score of centuries—as models worthy the imitation of all. It need hardly be said that, when all agree as to the merits of a particular work, it will be much easier to determine whether any attempted imitation of it is successful or not than if it were one of the opposite character, such, for example, as that of Hesiod, which is generally considered to possess quite as many defects as beauties.

The first line of his lordship's version may well warn the student of Homer that he has not much to expect in that quarter, for it is nothing more nor less than an indifferent specimen of inverted prose; at the same time it is word for word the same as the first line of Mumford's, as follows:

"Of Pelius' son, Achilles, sing, O Muse."

This is rather a singular coincidence, although there are many such in the new version. The few competent judges who have taken the trouble of examining Mumford's translation when it was first published utterly condemned it as one of the worst; but we fear that if the same will read Lord Derby's they will have to pass a still more severe sentence upon it. We transcribe another line and a half in continuation:

"The *vengeance deep and deadly;* whence to Greece
Unnumbered ills arose."

Now, in the original there is not a word about "vengeance" either "deep" or "deadly," but the "pernicious wrath" (*οὐλομένην μῆνιν*) which forms the subject of the whole poem; and it will be admitted that if particular pains ought to be taken with any part, in order that it might be correct, it should be with the statement of the poet's design. Mumford has borne this in mind much better than Derby, for the former translates as follows:

> "The direful wrath which sorrows numberless
> Brought on the Greeks."

This is much nearer the original than his lordship's version, although neither is good or even tolerable. Too often, indeed, Pope's Homer is but a paraphrase; more frequently, however, he gives much more of the Homeric expression than Derby, and he does so in the present instance:

> "Achilles' wrath, to Greece the direful spring
> Of woes unnumber'd, heavenly Goddess, sing!"

This sets forth the idea of Homer accurately enough, and is poetical withal, though greatly inferior in that respect to the original. Sotheby's version is more literal than Pope's, but not so poetical; it is as follows:

> "Sing, Muse! Pelides' wrath, whence woes and woes
> O'er the Acheans' gather'd host arose."

It matters little what other passage we take up, comparing different versions of it with each other; in nine cases out of ten his lordship's is at once the least poetical and least faithful to the original. Nor need we turn the second leaf for an example. The first important passage is the reply of Agamemnon to Chryses, the priest of Apollo, who comes to implore the liberation of his daughter for the large ransom which he is willing to pay for her. According to the interpretation of his lordship, the son of Atreus replies thus:

> "Her I release not till her youth *be fled;*
> Within *my* walls, in Argos, far from home,
> *Her lot is cast*, domestic cares to ply
> And share a *master's* bed. For thee, begone!
> Incense me not lest ill betide thee now."—i. 36-40.

So far as the gallantry of Agamemnon is concerned, which is the principal point in this passage, nothing could be more at variance with the spirit and obvious meaning of the original. In the whole Iliad there is nothing clearer than

the language of Homer in this instance. Nothing to justify the use of any such term as "master" is used in the original. The poet does not say "in *my* walls," as his translator does, nor "in *my* house," but "in *our* house," (ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ). He uses the plural because it is his intention to treat her as his wife. Had he meant to say "my" he would have done so, as he actually has in the following line, where he speaks of her as participating of his bed—ἐμὸν λέχος, (my bed). Had it not been sufficiently evident from this that Agamemnon did not mean to treat Chryseis as an ordinary mistress, much less to call himself her "master," as if she were a common servant, all doubt on this subject would have been set aside by the language which he applies to her on subsequent occasions. Thus, for example, according to his lordship's own rendering, the hero represents Chryseis as equal to his wife Clytemnestra, both in mind and body, and not less dear to him:

> "To me *not less* than Clytemnestra dear,
> My virgin wedded wife; nor less adorn'd
> In gifts of form, of feature, or of mind."—i. 133.

This is by no means as strong language as that of the original. What the latter plainly says is that he *prefers* Chryseis to Clytemnestra:

> "Καὶ γαρ ῥα Κλυταμνήστρης Προβέβουλα κουριδίης
> ἀλόχου."—i. 113, 114.

Here, too, Pope is much nearer the original, and vastly more poetical:

> "A maid, unmatch'd in manners as in face,
> Skill'd in each art, and crown'd with every grace.
> Not *half so dear* were Clytemnestra's charms,
> When first her blooming beauties bless'd my arms."

Madame Dacier, while denying that αντιόωσαν, as applied to λέχος (bed), means partaking, lest it might excite indelicate ideas in the reader, and maintaining that Agamemnon only meant that Chryseis should *make* his bed, admits the full force of his preference, and severely censures him for his lack of prudence. Bishop Eustathius, one of the best illustrators of Homer, tries to soften down the same word for the same reason; but neither makes Agamemnon speak in the arrogant, ungallant style of Lord Derby; nor, indeed, does any other translator whose version is worth quoting. But Homer has afforded us still more conclusive proof, if possible, that Agamemnon was not the ruthless enslaver of woman that he

is represented. Briseis, whom he forced from Achilles, was at least as beautiful as Chryseis; yet, when a reconciliation takes place between himself and that hero, he solemnly swears that he never had carnal intercourse with her.* That he was passionately fond of her he did not deny, but although he does not compare her mental or physical charms to those of Clytemnestra, he respected her too much to use any violence for the purpose of enjoying her charms. Now be it remembered that he treated Achilles in the most defiant manner when he forced Brjseis from his custody; and when under such circumstances he treated the latter not as a servant or mistress, but as a guest, is it likely that he designed to degrade Chryseis, as represented by Lord Derby?

Pope is rather indelicate in his version of the hero's reply to the lady's father; and he has been too closely imitated in that respect by Sotheby. As Mumford is the translator whose style that of his lordship most generally resembles, we transcribe the passage as rendered by the former, only premising that it would have been well had he been copied, even word for word, in this instance, as he seems to have been on other occasions:

> "I will not her relinquish, till old age
> *Invade* her, *dwelling* in *our* royal house
> At Argos, from her natal shore remote:
> There, with her shuttle at the loom employ'd,
> By day, the partner of my bed by night."

But we shall find his lordship little more faithful or reliable in any other passage we turn to, except it be in a speech. It is worthy of remark that as he is a pretty good orator, so does he make a very good attempt at translating some of the many fine speeches in Homer; and he is most successful in those to which his own style makes the nearest approach, for it is incredible to those not familiar with the subject, how many different styles are contained in the Iliad—styles, too, which the best writers on oratory, including Quintilian† and

---

* His lordship's own version of the oath is as follows:

> "These will I give; and with them will I send
> The fair Briseis, her whom from his tent
> I bore away; and add a solemn oath,
> I ne'er approach'd her bed, nor with her
> Such intercourse as man with woman holds."—ix. 152–156.

† Igitur, ut Aratus ab Jove incipiendem putat, ita nos rite coepturi ab *Homero* videmur. Hic enim quemadmodum ex oceano dicit ipse omnium vim fontiumque cursus initium capere, *omnibus eloquentiæ partibus exemplum et orum dedit.* Hunc nemo in magnis rebus sublimitate, in parvis proprietate superaverit.

Cicero, have regarded as models. As it not only affords us much pleasure to apply the language of approbation to Lord Derby, whenever we think he deserves it, but, indeed, a good deal more, we will give specimens before we close of one or two of his Homeric speeches, with the view of showing how much they excel his descriptions and other various parts of the Iliad, whose chief attractions in the original consist in their poetry and beauty. But we must first compare him more extensively with other translators; as for comparing him with Homer, we might as well attempt a comparison between the owl and the nightingale.

Now we turn to the first remarkable description that comes to our memory, that of Achilles approaching Hector, while the latter is soliloquizing on the probable fate of Troy. Nothing could be tamer, it will be seen, than his lordship's version of this celebrated passage:

"Thus as he stood, he mus'd; but near approach'd
Achilles, terrible as plumèd Mars;
From his right shoulder brandishing aloft
The ashen spear of Peleus, while around
Flash'd his bright armor, dazzling as the glare
Of burning fire, or of the rising sun.
Fear at the sight on valiant Hector seized;
Nor dar'd he there await th' attack, but left
The gates behind, and terror-stricken, fled,
Forward, with eager step, Pelides rush'd,
As when a falcon, bird of swiftest flight,
From some high mountain-top, on tim'rous dove
Swoops fiercely down; she, from beneath, in fear,
Evades the stroke; he, dashing through the brake,
Shrill-shrieking, pounces on his destin'd prey;
So, wing'd with desp'rate hate, Achilles flew,
So Hector, flying from his keen pursuit,
Beneath the walls his active sinews plied.
They by the watch-tow'r, and beneath the wall
Where stood the wind-beat fig-tree, rac'd amain
Along the carriage road, until they reach'd
The fairly-flowing fount whence issu'd forth,
From double source, Scamander's eddying streams.
One with hot current flows, and from beneath,
As from a furnace, clouds of steam arise;

Idem lætus ac pressus, jucundus et gravis, tum copia, tum brevitate mirabilis; nec poetica modo, sed oratoria virtute *eminentissimus*. (As Aratus, then, thinks that we ought to begin with Jupiter, so I think that I shall very properly commence with *Homer*; for, as he says, that the *might of rivers and the courses of springs take their rise from the ocean*, so has he himself *given a model and an origin for every species of eloquence*. No one has excelled him in sublimity on great subjects, no one in propriety in small. He is at once copious and concise, pleasing and forcible; admirable at one time for exuberance, and at another for brevity; eminent not only for poetic, but also for oratorical excellence.)—*De Institutione Oratoria*, lib. xc. 1. s. 46.

'Mid summer's heat the other rises cold
As hail, or snow, or water crystallized;
Beside the fountains the washing-troughs
Of well-wrought stone, where erst the wives of Troy
And daughters fair their choicest garments wash'd,
In peaceful times, ere came the sons of Greece.
There rac'd they, one in flight, and one pursuing;
Good he who fled, but better who pursu'd,
With fiery speed; for on that race was stak'd
No common victim, no ignoble ox:
The prize at stake was mighty Hector's life."—xxii. 155–191.

Mumford has done vastly better than this, or rather he as not done near so badly. We do not feel justified, how-ver, in occupying our space just now with his rendering. Ve prefer to make room for the version of Pope, which, though it gives but a very feeble idea of the startling vivid-ess and grandeur of the original, is highly poetical, and well alculated to strike the imagination.

"Thus pondering, like a god the Greek drew nigh,
His dreadful plumage nodded from on high;
The Pelian javelin in his better hand
Shot trembling rays that glitter'd o'er the land;
And on his breast the beamy splendors shone,
Like Jove's own lightning or the rising sun.
As Hector sees, unusual terrors rise,
Struck by some god, he fears, recedes, and flies;
He leaves the gates, he leaves the walls behind:
Achilles follows like the winged wind.
Thus at the panting dove a falcon flies
(The swiftest racer of the liquid skies):
Just when he holds or thinks he holds his prey,
Obliquely wheeling through the aerial way;
With open beak and shrilling cries he springs,
And aims his claws and shoots upon his wings:
No less fore-right the rapid chase they held,
One urg'd by fury, one by fear impell'd;
Now circling round the walls their course maintain,
Where the high watch-tower overlooks the plain;
Now where the fig-trees spread their umbrage broad
(A wider compass), smoke along the road.
Next by Scamander's double source they bound,
Where two fam'd fountains burst the parted ground;
This hot through scorching clefts is seen to rise,
With exhalations steaming to the skies;
That the green banks in summer's heat o'erflows,
Like crystal clear, and cold as winter snows.
Each gushing fount a marble cistern fills,
Whose polish'd bed receives the falling rills;
Where Trojan dames (ere yet alarmed by Greece)
Wash'd their fair garments in the days of peace.
By these they pass'd, one chasing, one in flight
(The mighty fled, pursued by stronger might),
Swift was the course; no vulgar prize they play,

No vulgar victim must reward the day
(Such as in races crown the speedy strife);
The prize contended was great Hector's life."—xxii. 173, *et seq.*

It requires no knowledge of the original to see how vastly superior this is to the version of Lord Derby; but let the reader who is familiar with Greek, compare both to the language and poetry of Homer, and then say whether his lordship should not feel a little mortified at having undertaken a task which is so evidently above his powers. Thus, he renders σείων "brandishing," χαλκὸς "ashen spear;" the simple word καπνὸς (vapor, or exhalation) he calls "clouds of steam," &c. Sotheby, who in general is more literal than Pope, but more prone to commit serious blunders, and not so poetical, commences the same passage as follows:

"Then firm remained, while tow'ring on his view,
Nigh grim-like Mars, in war, Achilles drew,
And o'er his shoulder vibrated on high
The Pelian lance, that flashed on Hector's eye,
Bright beamed his armor, like the lightning's blaze,
The fire flame, or the sun's ascending rays, &c."

Still less successful is his lordship in rendering the poet's description of the shield of Achilles. The merest tyro in translating could hardly attempt a rendering of this without giving some idea of the splendor of the original; nor has Lord Derby altogether failed to do so. Had we no other version of that renowned passage but his, and no knowledge of the original, we should set a high value upon it, the same as we would give almost anything for even an indifferent portrait of the deceased friend who is dear to us, rather than be without any. But we let the reader judge for himself:

"And first a shield he fashion'd, vast and strong,
With rich adornment; circled with a rim,
Threefold, bright-gleaming, whence a silver belt
Depended; of five folds the shield was form'd;
And on its surface many a rare design
Of curious art his practic'd skill had wrought.
Thereon were figur'd earth, and sky, and sea,
The ever-circling sun, and full-orb'd moon,
And all the signs that crown the vault of Heav'n;
Pleiads, and Hyads, and Orion's might,
And Arctos, call'd the Wain, who wheels on high
His circling course, and on Orion waits,
Sole star that never bathes in th' ocean wave.
And two fair populous towns were sculptur'd there;
In one were marriage, pomp, revelry,
And brides, in gay procession, through the streets,
With blazing torches from their chambers borne,
While frequent rose the hymeneal song.

ouths whirl'd around in joyous dance, with sound
)f flute and harp, and, standing at their doors,
dmiring women on the pageant gaz'd.
Meanwhile a busy throng the forum fill'd:
here, between two, a fierce contention rose,
bout a death fine; to the public one
ppeal'd, asserting to have paid the whole;
hile one denied that he had aught received.
oth were desirous that before the judge
he issue should be tried; with noisy shouts
he sev'ral partisans encouraged each.
he heralds still'd the tumult of the crowd:
)n polish'd chairs, in solemn circle, sat
he rev'rend elders; in their hands they held
he loud-voic'd heralds' sceptres; waving these,
hey heard th' alternate pleadings; in the midst
wo talents lay of gold, which he should take
Vho should before them prove his righteous cause."

—xviii. 538, *et seq.*

r the satisfaction of those unacquainted with the l, we transcribe Pope's version of the same passage, those who can conveniently do so to compare the s of Sotheby and Mumford also with that of his lord-

Then first he form'd th' immense and solid shield;
ich various artifice emblaz'd the field;
s utmost verge a threefold circle bound;
. silver chain suspends the massy round;
ive ample plates the broad expanse compose,
nd god-like labors on the surface rose.
here shone the image of the master-mind:
here earth, there heav'n, there ocean, he design'd;
h' unweary'd sun, the moon completely round;
he starry lights that heav'n's high convex crown'd;
he Pleiads, Hyads, with the Northern Team;
nd great Orion's more refulgent beam;
o which, around the axle of the sky,
he Bear revolving points his golden eye,
till shines exalted on th' ethereal plain.
or bathes his blazing forehead in the main.
Two cities radiant on the shield appear,
he image one of peace, and one of war.
ere sacred pomp and genial feast delight,
nd solemn dance, and Hymeneal rite!
long the street the new-made brides are led,
ith torches flaming, to the nuptial bed:
he youthful dancers in a circle bound
o the soft flute and cittern's silver sound:
hro' the fair streets, the matrons in a row
tand in their porches, and enjoy the show.
here, in the forum swarm a num'rous train,
he subject of debate a townsman slain:
ne pleads the fine discharg'd, which one deny'd,
nd bade the public and the laws decide:

The witness is produc'd on either hand:
For this, or that, the partial people stand:
Th' appointed heralds still the noisy bands,
And form a ring, with sceptres in their hands;
On seats of stone, within the sacred place,
The rev'rend elders nodded o'er the case;
Alternate, each th' attesting sceptre took,
And, rising solemn, each his sentence spoke.
Two golden talents lay amidst, in sight,
The prize of him who best adjudg'd the right."

We think it all the more strange that Lord Derby [illegible] not done better in this passage, because it does not requ[illegible]n poetic talent on the part of the translator so much a[illegible]s thorough knowledge of the original, and a complete mast[illegible]ry of the descriptive resources of the vernacular. We ha[illegible]ve had our doubts, since we took up the volumes before u[illegible]s, whether Lord Derby possesses the former qualificatio[illegible]n, although previously we had always regarded him as [illegible]an accomplished scholar; but there can be no doubt of his co[illegible]n-mand of the Anglo-Saxon. At all events, if his version be co[illegible]n-pared with the original, it will be seen that he is wanting [illegible] in one qualification or the other; and we think it more agre[illegible]e-able, as well as nearer the truth, to conclude that he h[illegible]as forgotten much of his Greek rather than that he has nev[illegible]er made himself sufficiently acquainted with the mother tongu[illegible]e; especially as he refrains from making any effort to sho[illegible]w, even by implication, that he has a critical knowledge of t[illegible]he Homeric language.

But let us compare a word or two of his with the cor[illegible]e-sponding words in the original, and see whether the form[illegible]er convey the same ideas as those so clearly and eloquentl[illegible]y expressed by the latter, for we hold that it is important th[illegible]t this fact should be known. Independently of the injury do[illegible]e to the cause of sound literature, and consequently to th[illegible]e public taste, by misrepresenting the ideas of a great writ[illegible]er to those who have no means of ascertaining the truth, it [illegible]is well known that there is scarcely any literary institutio[illegible]n, however high its standard of learning,, or however vigila[illegible]nt and faithful are its professors, whose students do not use tran[illegible]s-lations to a greater or less extent in preparing their classic[illegible]al exercises. We do not, indeed, think that many will consu[illegible]ll his lordship's translation for this purpose, except his person[illegible]al friends and admirers; but a few will make use of eve[illegible]ry work of the kind for which a printer and publisher have be[illegible]en found, no matter how.

Now, let us suppose that a student takes up Derby's

ion of the shield of Achilles, as a means of help-
to understand that of Homer. He goes to the first
have copied and finds that *μέγα* is represented by
and *στιβαρον* by "strong;" whereas one simply
"large" or "immense," and the other "solid," the
nding Latin terms being *magnum* and *solidium* respect-
Still worse is the second line, in which the sonorous
aphic Homeric expression *πάντοσε δαιδάλλον* is
ated by "with rich adornment;" "circled with a
the same line, is all we have for *περὶ δ' ἄντυγα.*
re pass on to another paragraph, we shall find pretty
he same state of things; as, for example where the
l and graphic expression, *Ἠέλιόν τ' ἀκάμαντα*
wearied sun) is rendered by "the ever-circling sun."
ribing the contention in the forum, Lord Derby an-
the cause as "about a death fine," without giving
der the least intimation of the important fact that a
s been slain, which is clearly and prominently set
the original by the words *ἀνδρὸς ἀποθοιμένου.*
ument is necessary to show that "about a death"
mean the death of a horse, a cat, or a dog, which
be a somewhat different thing from the death of a

h as Pope is censured for his want of fidelity to the
, he never makes so important an omission as this:
be seen, from the passage we have transcribed above
s version, that he gives the subject of debate as "a
an slain." We have had the curiosity to turn to
rd's version to see whether his lordship has taken him
guide in this case, as he seems to have done in others,
find that the resemblance between the Virginian
at and the ex-premier of England is, as usual, very
but the former is undoubtedly nearer to the original
e latter, since, if he also omits to give the term man,
that of "murder" instead of "death," as follows:

> "But in the forum swarm'd a busy crowd,
> Two men contended there; one claimed a fine
> For *murder* due; the other solemnly
> Averr'd, before the people, all was paid."

give one more famous passage from the twenty-
book, that in which the venerable Priam tries to
e his son Hector from engaging the terrible Achilles,
he sees advancing furiously, eager for his blood.
speaking, this is not a speech, but a conversational

Achilles presented to Priam, and then proceeds to desc its effect. The following is Lord Derby's version:

"Then wept the sage
The old man groan'd aloud, and lifting high
His hands, he beat his head, and with loud voice
Call'd on his son, imploring; he, unmov'd,
Held post before the gates, awaiting there
Achilles' fierce encounter; him, his sire,
With hands outstretch'd and piteous tone, address'd:
'Hector, my son, await not here alone
That warrior's charge, lest thou to fate succumb,
Beneath Pelides' arm, thy better far!
Accurs'd be he! would that th' immortal gods
So favour'd him as I! then should his corpse
Soon to the vultures and the dogs be giv'n!
(So should my heart a load of anguish lose,)
By whom am I of many sons bereav'd,
Many and brave, whom he has slain or sold
To distant isles in slav'ry; and e'en now,
Within the city wall I look in vain
For two, Lycaon brave, and Polydore,
My gallant sons by fair Laothoë:
If haply yet they live with brass and gold
Their ransom shall be paid: good store of these
We can command; for with his daughter fair
A wealthy dow'ry aged Atles gave.
But to the viewless shades should they have gone,
Deep were their mother's sorrow and my own;
But of the gen'ral public, well I know
Far lighter were the grief, than if they heard
That thou had'st fall'n beneath Achilles' hand.
Then enter now, my son, the city gates,
And of the women and the men of Troy
Be still the guardian; nor to Peleus' son,
With thine own life immortal glory give.
Look on me with pity; me, on whom,
[illegible]

My soul shall from my body be divorc'd;
Those dogs which I myself have bred,
Fed at my table, guardians of my gate,
Shall lap my blood, and overgorg'd shall lie
Ev'n on my threshold. That the young shall fall
Victim to Mars, beneath a foeman's spear,
Is only natural; and if he fall
With honor, though he die, yet glorious he!
But when the hoary head, and hoary beard,
And naked corpse to rav'ning dogs are giv'n,
No sadder sight can wretched mortal see."—xxii., 38-90.

; will be seen that, although this is much better, as we said, than any of his lordship's descriptions, it is far or to Pope's version, and we may add that it is far less ul to the original:

" He strikes his reverend head, now white with age;
He lifts his wither'd arms; obtests the skies;
He calls his much-lov'd son with feeble cries.
The son, resolv'd Achilles' force to dare,
Full at the Scæan gates expects the war;
While the sad father on the rampart stands
And thus adjures him with extended hands:
Ah, stay not, stay not! guardless and alone;
Hector! my lov'd, my dearest, bravest son!
Methinks already I behold thee slain,
And stretched beneath that fury of the plain.
Implaceable Achilles! might'st thou be
To all the gods no dearer than to me!
Thee, vultures wild should scatter round the shore,
And bloody dogs grow fiercer from thy gore.
How many valiant sons I late enjoy'd,
Valiant in vain! by thy curst arm destroy'd:
Or, worse than slaughter'd, sold in distant isles
To shameful bondage and unworthy toils.
Two, while I speak, my eyes in vain explore,
Two from one mother sprung, my Polydore,
And, lov'd Lycaon; now perhaps no more!
Oh! if in yonder hostile camp they live,
What heaps of gold, what treasures would I give?
(Their grandsire's wealth, by right of birth their own.
Consign'd his daughter with Lelegia's throne)
But if (which heav'n forbid) already lost,
All pale they wander on the Stygian coast;
What sorrows then must their sad mother know,
What anguish I? unutterable woe!
Yet less that anguish, less to her, to me,
Less to all Troy, if not depriv'd of thee.
Yet shun Achilles! enter the wall:
And spare thyself, thy father, spare us all!
Save thy dear life; or if a soul so brave
Neglect that thought, thy dearer glory save.
Pity, while yet I live, those silver hairs,
While yet thy father feels the woes he bears,
Yet curs'd with sense! a wretch whom, in his rage

The last sad relic of my ruin'd state
(Dire pomp of sovereign wretchedness!) must fall,
And stain the pavement of my regal hall;
Where famished dogs, late guardians of my door,
Shall lick their mangled master's spatter'd gore.
Yet for my sons I thank ye, gods! 'twas well;
Well have they perish'd, for in fight they fell.
Who dies in youth and vigor dies the best
Struck through with wounds, all honest on the breast;
But when the Fates, in fulness of their rage,
Spurn the hoar head of unresisting age,
In dust the reverend lineaments deform,
And pour to dogs the life-blood scarcely warm.
This, this is misery! the last, the worst,
That man can feel; man fated to be curst!"

We will now transcribe his lordship's version of the Homeric speeches, selecting the deliberativ as that in which he is most successful himself as a mentary orator. The best specimens in the Iliad orations of Ulysses, Phœnix, and Ajax, when sent l memnon as ambassadors to Achilles for the pur moving the latter to a reconciliation with the former of the three ambassadors makes a speech to Achil receives a reply from the hero. No three orations ev ered on the same subject are more unlike; yet it is to say which is the best; which is constructed wi art; which is most persuasive; or which is best ca to disarm resentment. Not a superfluous expression by any of the ambassadors; not one which the circun do not seem to require. Nor is there anything omit use of which the most accomplished orator might su arising from any of the circumstances under wh

identally, of former agreeable scenes in the tent of Agamnon; then of his slaughtered countrymen; then of the ger that threatens the whole army of the Greeks; then the advice of his father Peleus; then of the regret of amemnon for having offended him, and of his wish to ke all reparation in his power, &c. After the ambassadors re partaken of the hospitalities of the hero, Ulysses addresses n as follows:

"To thee I drink,
Achilles! nobly is thy table spread,
As heretofore in Agamemnon's tent,
So now in thine; abundant is the feast:
But not the pleasures of the banquet now
We have in hand: impending o'er our arms
Grave cause of fear, illustrious chief, we see;
Grave doubts, to save, or see destroy'd our ships,
If thou, great warrior, put not forth thy might.
For close beside the ships and wall are camp'd
The haughty Trojans and renown'd allies:
Their watch-fires frequent burn throughout the camp;
And loud their boast that naught shall stay their hands
Until our dark-ribb'd ships be made their prey.
Jove too for them, with fav'ring augury
Sends forth his lightning; boastful of his strength,
And firmly trusting in the aid of Jove,
Hector, resistless, rages; naught he fears
Or God or man, with martial fury fir'd.
He prays, impatient, for th' approach of morn;
Then, breaking through the lofty sterns, resolv'd
To the devouring flames to give the ships,
And slay the crews, bewilder'd in the smoke.
And much my mind misgives me, lest the gods
His threats fulfil, and we be fated here
To perish, far from Argos' grassy plains.
Up, then! if in their last extremity
Thy spirit inclines, though late, to save the Greeks
Sore press'd by Trojan arms: lest thou thyself
Hereafter feel remorse; the evil done
Is past all cure; then thou reflect betimes
How from the Greeks to ward the day of doom.
Dear friend, remember now thy father's words,
The aged Peleus, when to Atreus' so
He sent thee forth from Phthia, how he said,
'My son, the boon of strength, if so they will,
Juno or Pallas have the power to give;
But thou thyself thy haughty spirit must curb,
For better far is gentle courtesy:
And cease from angry strife, that so the Greeks
The more may honor thee, both young and old.'
Such were the words thine aged father spoke,
Which thou hast now forgotten; yet, ev'n now,
Pause for awhile, and let thine anger cool;
And noble gifts, so thou thy wrath remit,
From Agamemnon shalt thou bear away.
Listen to me, while I recount the gifts
Which in his tent he pledg'd him to bestow."—ix., 267-314.

This, as we have said, is a very good speech in Lord Derby's version, although his lordship has allowed the poetry to evaporate. The address of Ulysses does not end here; he now proceeds to describe the splendid gifts which Agamemnon is anxious to bestow on Achilles, and his lordship has no faculty for poetical description. Even the beautiful Lesbians make but a sorry figure at his hands, thus:

> "Sov'n *women* too, *well skill'd in household cares*,
> Lesbians, whom *he selected for himself*,
> That day thou captur'dst Lesbos' goodly isle,
> In beauty far surpassing all their sex."

There is no poetry in this; let us compare with it the four lines of Pope:

> "Seven lovely captives of the Lesbian line,
> Skilled in each art, unmatch'd in form divine,
> The same he chose for more than vulgar charms
> When Lesbos sank beneath thy conquering arms."

But it is in the pathetic his lordship fails most. In proof of this we refer any intelligent reader to his attempts in this department; no matter what form they assume, whether that of a speech or discussion. Compare his rendering of the celebrated appeal of Andromache to Hector, the speech of Patroclus to Achilles, or that of Priam to the same hero, with the versions of Pope of the same. We transcribe as a specimen the lamentation of Briseis for Patroclus, subjoining Pope's rendering of the same:

> "Patroclus, dearly lov'd of this sad heart!
> When last I left this tent, I left thee full
> Of lusty life; returning now, I find
> Only thy lifeless corpse, thou Prince of men!
> So sorrow still, on sorrow heap'd I bear.
> The husband of my youth, to whom my sire
> And honor'd mother gave me, I beheld
> Slain with the sword before the city walls:
> Three brothers, whom with me one mother bore,
> My dearly lov'd ones, all were doom'd to death:
> Nor wouldst thou, when Achilles, swift of foot,
> My husband slew, and royal Mynes' town
> In ruin laid, allow my tears to flow;
> But thou wouldst make me (such was still thy speech)
> The wedded wife of Peleus' godlike son:
> Thou wouldst to Phthia bear me in thy ship,
> And there, thyself, amid the Myrmidons,
> Wouldst give my marriage feast; then unconsol'd,
> I weep thy death, my ever-gentle friend!"

In this there is little pathos—scarcely any of the tenderness of the original. It is otherwise with Pope's version.

Perhaps no other passage we could have selected would give a more correct idea of the difference between a true poet and one who is no poet, as a translator of Homer, although almost any of the other pathetic speeches to which we have alluded lay a deeper and more enduring hold on our sympathies.

"Ah youth for ever dear, for ever kind,
Once tender friend of my distracted mind!
I left thee fresh in life, in beauty gay;
Now find thee cold, inanimated clay!
What woes my wretched race of life attend?
Sorrows on sorrows, never doom'd to end!
The first lov'd comfort of my virgin bed
Before these eyes in fatal battle bled:
My three brave brothers in one mournful day,
All trod the dark, irremeable way:
Thy friendly hand uprear'd me from the plain;
And dry'd my sorrows for a husband slain;
Achilles' care you promis'd I should prove,
The first, the dearest partner of his love;
That rites divine should ratify the band,
And make me empress in his native land.
Accept these grateful tears! for thee they flow,
For thee, that ever felt another's woe!"—Il., xix., 303-320.

But we find that our space is exhausted, and can give no more specimens. We would, however, advise the reader to extend his examination; for, if he would not profit much by reading his lordship's version, but rather run the risk of being led by it to form a false estimate of Homer's style, he would lose nothing in this way for which he would not be fully indemnified in comparing the different versions with each other. He would, at least, be able to form an idea of the structure of the Iliad, and the marvellous variety of its materials. At first sight this might seem an easy task, but there are few more difficult; although the most thoughtless cannot read Homer without finding beauties in every page, no poet is understood by so small a number. Thus, for example, the wrath of Achilles seems an absurd thing to the casual observer as the subject of a poem; but there is a deep moral in it, namely, that concord among governors is the preservation of states, and that discord is the ruin of them. Even the episodes contribute to develop this idea; and how full of beauty the most incredible of them are at the same time! still more forcibly does that remark apply to the allegorical fables; such, for example, as Discord cast out of heaven to earth; (*) Love alluring and extinguishing Honor;† Prudence restraining Pas-

* xix., 93. † iii., 460.

sion, represented in the machine of Minerva descending to calm Achilles.* Nor is there a speech or expression in the whole poem whose tendency was in any manner objectionable when it was written which is not censured as such, directly or indirectly, by the poet. Thus we have often heard it objected to the Iliad that it is all in glorification of war and bloodshed; but in no other work, sacred or profane, is war more strongly condemned. Perhaps we cannot more appropriately conclude this article than by quoting the words of the sage Nestor, as translated by Pope, in proof of this:

> "Curs'd is the man and void of law and right,
> Unworthy property, unworthy light,
> Unfit for public rule or private care,
> That wretch, that monster, who delights in war:
> Whose lust is murder, and whose horrid joy,
> To tear his country, and his kind destroy."—Il., xx., 87-92.

ART. II.—1. *Erinnerungen an Wilhelm von Humboldt.* Von GUSTAV SCHLESIER. 2 Theile. Stuttgart, 1843–1845.

2. *Wilhelm von Humboldt: Lebensbild und Charakteristik.* Von R. HAYM.* Berlin, 1856.

3. *Wilhelm von Humboldt's gesammelte Werke.* Herausg. von CARL BRANDES. Vols. i–vii, 8vo. Berlin, 1841–1852.

4. *Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java.* Von WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT. Herausg. von CARL BUSCHMANN. 3 vols., 4to. Berlin, 1836–1839.

AMONG those who have labored in the department of general linguistics and comparative philology, Wilhelm von Humboldt is one of the earliest and most successful. Commencing with the dawn of the century, his studies run parallel with those of William Schlegel, Raynouard, Grimm, Bopp; and if, on the one hand, he has accomplished less of specialty than most of his contemporaries, he has, on the other, extended his horizon far beyond them, and is, in fact, the first who ventured to elevate the science into a universal one. Inspired by this idea, he not only made his investigations, both geographically and historically, co-extensive with

* xi., 261.

globe, but he also did not shun the labor of entering, the spirit of true science, into the abstruser questions ruing the nature and origin of language, its relation to uman intelligence, to history, philosophy, civilization, umanity, and has left us the outlines of a system which ade his name illustrious. It is true that more than f his positions have been controverted, that he has been ed of inconsistency, of vagueness, and of mysticism, at few of the more recent investigators are willing to t him without qualification; but this does not destroy trinsic value of his contributions, and we apprehend ttle contradiction in asserting that no works in this de- ent can be produced that are more suggestive, and more y of attentive study. It is on this account, and for the it of the student, that we now propose, in the first place, e a rapid sketch of the history and chronological order of searches, and then to add as complete and clear an ex- on of his system as our proposed limit will admit.

fter having for many years indulged in the somewhat tory, but none the less earnest and assiduous study of cal literature and antiquities, of theoretical as well as cal philosophy and æsthetics, Humboldt at length to feel the want of some central object for his intel- l activity, and one into which he might infuse the whole individuality and native force. Such an object pre- l itself to him in the science of linguistics, the out- of which he happened to conceive towards the close of st century. Near the end of the year 1799 we find riting to the philologian Wolf, that it was then his to illustrate the theory of æsthetics with practical les, and that for that purpose he had already studied d French literature, and was then engaged in examining panish. "But even more than by the study of litera- he says, "I am attracted by the study of language. I clined to think that hereafter I shall occupy myself it much more exclusively, and that a thorough and sophically conducted comparison of several languages ask for which, after a few years of earnest application, Goulders might perhaps grow equal."*

he commencement of these new researches links itself to cident of Humboldt's residence in Paris. It was there in the year 1800, his attention was attracted to the lan-

* Werke, vol. 5, p. 214.

guage of the primitive inhabitants of northern Spain, whose national peculiarities and history had already interested him some time before. And so rapid were his advances that by the autumn of that year he had already consulted all the works and manuscripts of the Royal Library in reference to his subject, which he dropped only to resume with new energy in the spring of the following year, while during the summer he spent several weeks in the Basque provinces of Spain and France, to search some of their archives for new material, and to complete his examinations by personal contact with the inhabitants themselves.*

When, in 1802, he went as Prussian minister to Rome, his mind was at first occupied with the antiquities of the city, and with his translations from Æschylus and Pindar. But he had already advanced too far with his new science to forget it long or at all, and he soon returned to it, never to drop it again. "At bottom," says he to Wolf, "is everything I drive at, even my Pindar, study of language. I think I have discovered the art of using language as a vehicle for traversing the loftiest and profoundest spheres of human existence, and I find mirrored in it the multiplicity of the entire world." † To the study of the Basque he soon added researches into the origin and affinity of European languages in general; and when, on his return from the Western Continent, his brother Alexander made him a present of the ample materials on the American languages which he had collected there, his horizon extended itself still further, and already promised to embrace the entire globe. And for these studies Rome itself was really to some extent the centre of the world. There was the Propaganda, whose object, although avowedly ecclesiastical, was yet intimately linked to a knowledge of the languages, and of a great variety of them. Humboldt did not fail to turn the religious object to scientific account; and during his residence at Rome, the rich library of the Collegio Romano, with other valuable collections, opened to him treasures from which at a later date his industry and philosophical acumen eliminated the science of comparative philology.

Humboldt's linguistical career, commencing, as we have already seen, in 1799, extended itself throughout the whole of the remainder of his life, that is to say, until the year 1835. Its history presents to us three distinct periods, of

* Haym's "Wilhelm von Humboldt," p. 201.
† *Werke*, vol. 5. Haym's "Wilhelm von Humboldt," pp. 240-242.

first comprises his researches into the Basque and
can languages; the second, those on the Sanscrit,
e and the Egyptian hieroglyphics; and the last,
the Malay languages of the Asiatic and Austra-
-world, including, as the culmination of the whole,
celebrated dissertation on the structural differences
speech, introductory to his great work on the old
n of Java.

t attempts proceeded from an ethnographico-histor-
of view, and he himself confesses that he then
on the study of languages merely as "a science
to that of history and ethnography." It was in
that, in 1812, he published a prospectus of a mono-
he Basque tribe, in which he declared it his inten-
mine into the manners, the language, and the his-
t tribe, with a view to determine, if possible, the
s to whether it is to be considered as a separate
nerely a remnant of a larger family of nations, and
t event it should be classified.* Of this monograph,
nothing appeared except some fragments in one
velling sketches (*Reiseskizzen aus Biscaya*), until, in
; length came out with his "Examination of the In-
s concerning the Aboriginal Inhabitants of Spain,
is of the Basque Language,"† In this essay the
deftakes, through an analysis of the old Spanish
laces, to trace the earliest geographical distribution
y of the inhabitants of the Pyrenean peninsula,
ses his main object to be to invite other investiga-
ve to the primitive populations of the whole of
nd southern Europe. From this ethnographical
ew Humboldt, however, soon departed, when, a few
, at the request of Vater, he wrote his purely
l corrections and additions to Adelung's article on
e language in the "Mithridates,"‡ and when, in a
he promised monograph, he contemplated a search-
s of the unique idiom in question. The change
ll more complete after he began to include the
he Romanish and the American languages, with a
nore general comparison. He now declared it his
o apply a systematic and exhausting method to the
one language, and then gradually to extend the

---

egel's "Deutscher Museum," vol. 2 pp. 487 and 490. (No. 12.)
d in *Werke*, vol. 2.
r's "Mithridates," vol. 4.

process to others, until they all might be arranged and classified in an immense universal encyclopedia of human speech. In this preliminary analysis of a particular language, his professed aim was "an intelligible exposition of all the individual parts of speech, their relation to each other and to the totality of language considered as a representative medium; and lastly, of the relation between this medium and the objects represented." In thus passing from one language to all of them and from all of them to language or speech, as such, he not only arrived at a metaphysical conception of his subject, but he also gave his previous ethnographico-historical researches a broader and a deeper background than they had before. He had, in other words, now reached the philosophy of language, and the point at which it coincides with the philosophy of history. It is true that the details of his plan were as yet not entirely clear even to himself, and that on that account his language was often vague and mystical; but his fundamental idea was nevertheless already as correct as it was orignal and profound, and it was destined to gain clearness and consistency as he made new advances in his researches.

The second stadium of Humboldt's linguistical career commences with his inquiry into the Sanscrit. Up to the year 1812 he had taken but a distant interest in this language, and the American idioms, in addition to the Basque, had occupied his attention almost exclusively. But about the years 1814 and 1815 he began to look more closely into the East, and he soon became convinced of the paramount importance of the ancient sacred idiom of India to the new science in which he had enlisted. He commenced the study of the language, therefore, by devoting an entire year of leisure to it, and subsequently made renewed efforts to perfect himself in it. It could not be otherwise than that the character of this eastern mother idiom, should have at once led Humboldt to a profounder insight into the general nature of language, and to a clearer apprehension of its elements.

That this was really so, and that Humboldt made substantial advances in his new science, is manifest from several important contributions to the transactions of the Prussian Academy, of which he had become a member as early as 1810. In the first place, he read, in 1820, a dissertation "On the Comparative Study of Language, and its Relation to the Different Epochs of the Development of the Languages,"[o]

[o] *Werke*, vol. 3, p. 269, *seq.*

which he undertook to define the nature and aim of study, and to vindicate its dignity and independence. s dissertation was followed by another in 1821, "On the vince of the Historian,"* which, in spite of its title, was cely anything more than a preliminary to his linguistical arches; a generalized and independent development of element of the science which approximates it closely to of history. The third dissertation, read in 1822, exhi- a still more decided influence of the Sanscrit, and the ortance of this language for the study of the philosophy of an speech. It was "On the Origin of the Grammatical ns, and their Influence on the Development of our Ideas,"† ssay abounding in significant suggestions in reference to istorical growth, the internal structure and the general re of human speech. These three dissertations may be ed upon as the first expansion and intensification of the s advanced but fragmentarily some years before in his pectus relative to the Basque, and in the preface to his slation of the Agamemnon of Æschylus. They im- ed to his studies a more philosophical direction, and led way to more important and decisive results. For if to English and the French be due the credit of having first ght the languages of the East to the knowledge of ope, it was reserved for Humboldt to win Germany the or of linking that knowledge to the ultimate and highest rest of man, and to transform it from ideal points of r into the order and consistency of a universal science. But notwithstanding these advances, no one was more cious than Humboldt himself of the insufficiency of the lts, and of the necessity of a more extended examination letails in order to secure a safe basis for his theory. It this account that, when he found that the Chinese stood ontradiction to some of the general principles of his dis- ations, he did not shun the labor of undertaking the study his language likewise, and of comparing its peculiar char- eristics with the results of his previous researches. It then that the celebrated letter originated, addressed to el-Rémisat, *Sur la nature des formes grammaticales en général, et le génie de la langue Chinoise en particulier:* an essay in ich his previously developed views concerning the nature the grammatical forms, the origin, development, and gen- l structure of language, are partly corrected, partly ex-

* *Werke*, vol. 1, p. 1, *seq.* † *Werke*, vol. 3, p. 241, *seq.*

panded, or more clearly defined, with perpetual reference to the apparently abnormal and irregular character of the Asiatic idiom in question.

But there was still another point which yet awaited his attention. This was "The Nature of Writing, and its relation to Language in general." This subject suggested itself naturally to him from Champollion's new discoveries respecting the hieroglyphics, to the study of which he applied himself with great assiduity, and, in connection with it, also to the Coptic. That his researches in this direction, too, were as successful as they were earnest and profound, is manifest from several important dissertations, which he read before the Academy, chiefly during the years 1824 and 1825. They are entitled: "On the Phonetic Hieroglyphics of Champollion the Younger;" "On four Egyptian Lion-headed Statues;" "On the Relation between Writing and Speech;" and lastly, his incomplete paper, "On Alphabetic Writing, and its Connection with the Structure of Language."*

We have now seen enough of Humboldt's proceedings to perceive that he aimed at nothing short of the universality and necessity of fundamental law in his linguistical studies. He could not, therefore, consider his position safe as long as there were other languages, or groups of them, to be examined, and compared with the results already obtained, in reference to a philosophical theory of speech. It was thus that, in 1827, he commenced a new series of researches; and this time they were directed to the group or groups extending from Sumatra to Easter Island, and from New Zealand to the Sandwich Islands; in other words, to the groups of the entire Asiatic and Australian island-world, in which he suspected the existence of a middle ground between the domains of the Hindu and the American languages. We thus find him already, in 1828, reading before the Academy an essay "On the Language of the South Sea Islanders," and between 1829 and 1831 applying himself with new zeal to the study of the Mexican.†

But he soon relinquished the American languages to younger investigators, to concentrate his attention within the limits of a narrower sphere, to the point where he suspected a contact between the civilization of the Hindus and

* *Werke*, vol. 7, p. 294; and earlier separate edition, Paris, 1827. Its date is March, 1826.

† *Werke*, vol. 6, p. 488, *seq.*; vol. 4, p. 302, *seq.*; vol. 6, p. 426, *seq.*; vol. 6, p. 526, *seq.*

members of the Malay group. Such a point of contact ound in the island of Java, in which there were manifest es of Hindu influence, and where this influence culmin- l in the Kawi language, a peculiar, learned idiom, in its acter and object similar to the Sanscrit.

The new study was soon attended with results, and he l an essay "On the Kawi Language" before the Academy arly as January, 1831. And so great an importance did he ch to this ancient idiom, as a point of departure for a e extended survey of the Malay group, that he resolved ubject both its grammatical and lexical elements to a ute analysis. His plan in doing so was, in the first place, rove it to be the result of the epoch at which Hindu ure flourished on the island, and then, by an elimination ıe Malay element, to make the latter the basis for an in- led examination of the remaining idioms akin to it. It to this study that Humboldt devoted the whole of the ainder of his life, and it gave rise to his great work "On Kawi Language," the completion of which, however, he ır lived to see, and which, as we have it now, was edited the Academy by Bushmann, after the author's decease. long and profoundly philosophical introduction to this k, however, as well as the portion of it which treats of connection between India and Java, both of them have, ınately for us, received the final touches of the author self.*

Before speaking of this introduction, which embodies all results of Humboldt's researches in that direction, it is ssary to notice a few more minor treatises composed be- ən the years 1827 and 1829, all of them relating to ɔrtant points connected with the theory of speech. The of them is a fragmentary dissertation "On the Dualis,"† before the Academy in 1827, in which the method of ɔience is developed with a clearness and precision such ɔne of his previous writings ever exhibited, and in which grammatical form in question is analysed in its most in- te connection with the nature of speech. The next is ıo less remarkable and profound essay "On the Affinity een the Local Adverbs and the Pronoun in certain lan- es,"‡ in which the origin and function of the pronoun are

---

Uber die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java. 3 vols. Berlin, 1836–1839.

Werke; vol vi., p. 562, *seq.*

In the Academy's *Abhandlungen*, Berlin, 1830.

discussed, with illustrative examples from the Japanese, the Armenian, and the Tongish. In 1828, he read before the French Institute a dissertation "On the Affinity of the Pluperfect, the Reduplicating Aorist, and the Attic Perfect of the Greek, with the Tense-formation of the Sanscrit;"* and the same year we find an English essay "On the best means of ascertaining the Affinities of Oriental Languages," addressed to Sir Alexander Johnston, and read before the Royal Asiatic Society of London on the 14th of June.† He had, in a similar manner, some time before, read an essay "On the Nature of the Verb," based upon observations on the American languages; and there are a number of other dissertations of a similar character which have thus far never appeared in type.

From all the documents which we have here enumerated it would not be difficult to construct a system of the philosophy of language as designed by Humboldt. But the author has exempted us from this labor by drawing the balance of the results of his immense researches, in the admirable introduction already spoken of, in which, with a profundity and acuteness rarely equalled, he discusses "The Structural Differences of Human Speech, and their Influence on the Intellectual Development of the Human Race."‡ Here, once more, he, as in fact in all his previous studies, links language and linguistics not merely to ethnography, but to the historical development of the race, to civilization, culture, and, in fine, to the highest problems connected with the nature of man. It is this introduction, therefore, which, in an attempt to expound Humboldt's system, shall have to form the main basis for our proceeding, while, at the same time, it will be our duty not to neglect such hints as we may be able to glean from the remaining portions of his writings already mentioned.

In this exposition of his system, Humboldt discusses the question concerning the origin, the definition, and the essential nature of language, the process of speech as exhibited in its constitutive elements, in articulation, the relation between thought and sound, the formation of roots, words, and grammatical forms, &c.; then, further, the organic principle and character of language, the idea of language, and the classifica-

* *Cf. Werke*, vol. vi., p. 258; vol. vii., p. 352.

† *Werke*, vol. vi., p. 423.

‡ Reprinted in *Werke*, vol. vi., pp. 1–425. Original quarto edition, Berlin, 1836.

n of languages; and, finally, the development of language history, and its relation to the latter. We shall now en- vor to give a brief outline of Humboldt's answers to all se questions.

The question concerning the origin of language is older n the time of Plato's Cratylus, from which we perceive t at that time it was current even among the sophists, l must have been so before them among the philosophers. recurs again in Aristotle and his followers, and among the derns in Bacon, Hobbes, Berkeley, Leibnitz, Spinoza, l the French materialists of the last century. All these losophers agree in attributing a human origin to lan- ge, and they only differ in their method of accounting it; some making it a matter of necessity and invention, ers the natural result of our physical and intellectual anization. Among the Germans, the empirical psycho- ists of the eighteenth century attempted a pragmatical lanation, and like many of their predecessors, made man speech the result of arbitrary convention, while ir opponents, the theologians, vindicated for it no less just an origin than a divine one, by claiming the Divinity nself as the first teacher of the human race. The latter of se hypotheses obtained very extensively, until the time of rder, who supplanted it by investing its human origin th a profounder significance. According to him, language is ther so far above man that the Divinity should have been essary to invent it for him, nor so far below man that the te should have been able to invent it. It is the necessary conjoint result of sensibility and reflection, both of them ng upon the basis of man's natural organization and of his nection with the external world. It is his reflection that converted the sounds of nature into significant signs, and sted them with a human element; and it is, again, his re- ion which, in connection with feeling, has converted the s and colors of the external world into sounds of speech. Language is thus neither the inevitable product of mere sical organization, nor the mechanical manifestation of e emotion, and least of all is it the result of arbitrary al convention; but it originates in the depths of the con- us human soul, and constitutes the distinctive charac- stic of our race *ab extra*, as reason does that from within. Now, although Herder's theory was much more poetical n philosophical, Humboldt could yet scarcely do otherwise n follow in its traces, and develop more consistently

and profoundly what his predecessor had only indicated and invested with the garb of imagery. Humboldt's preparation for the question, however, was a much more thorough and extensive one than that of Herder. It was based not only on immense researches, but also on the no less earnest study of philosophy, more especially of the Critical System, and of the great poets Goëthe and Schiller, of both of whom he had been not only a reader, but one of the most eminent critics.

With Humboldt, therefore, the theory of a divine origin could no longer be a question, any more than the pragmatical or materialistic philosophical solutions by which he was preceded. In opposition to the notion of an "invention," he advances "that language could not be invented unless its type already pre-existed in the human intelligence;" "that man is man (*i. e.*, a human being) only in virtue of speech, and that consequently to invent speech he would already have to be man."*

Humboldt is equally averse to the theory which derives language from the necessity of mutual assistance. "Speech," he says, "flows spontaneously, without any necessitation or even design, from the human breast. Man is essentially a singing being, but he links thoughts to his notes."† This explanation is substantially the same as that advanced in another passage, where he seeks the source of language in our "general capacity for speech," and designates it as the natural development of a faculty characterizing man as such.‡ And so far is he from making it the product of reflection or convention, that in another place he declares it "a veritable and inexplicable wonder that such a thing as a language should spring from the mouth of a nation, but a phenomenon no less astonishing than that which is repeated daily among us, although overlooked with indifference, in the stammering accents of every child."‖

In his letter to Rémusat he declares himself expressly against the notion of a direct divine intervention, and accounts for the origin of human speech by the *génie inné à l'homme pour les langues;* but at the same time he vindicates for this innate faculty so high a place in our nature as to approximate it to the divine, and maintains inherent in it an *étincelle divine, qui luit à travers tous les idiomes, même les plus imparfaits et les moins cultivés.*§

After thus defining his position in reference to the con-

* *Werke*, vol. iii., p. 252-253. † *Id.*, vol. vi., pp. 60-61. ‡ *Id.*, vol. vi., p.
‖ Schlegel's *Museum*, vol. ii., p. 498. § *Werke*, vol. vii., p. 337.

d point concerning the origin of language, and claiming it to e a purely human one, Humboldt next proceeds to give us ıe key to its comprehension, and this he asserts to be "the hysiology of the intellectual man." In language, he says, ıe human intellect operates according to certain laws pre-sely like nature, and speech is the effect of our rational ıstinct. It is therefore the product of nature, but of the ature of the human reason; and if we enquire into the roduction of language, we have to look for it, in the indi-idual as well as in the collective masses called nations, at ıe point where the first symptoms of intellect begin to ake their appearance.*

These definitions contain the determination of the eneral nature of language. As a product of the intellec-ıal instinct of man, it is as perpetually alive as this ıstinct itself. It is not to be regarded as a *caput mortuum*, ıt as a living production, and as the act of this production self. Its very essence consists in something that is in a ate of constant and momentary motion. It is not so much ı ἔργον, or work, as it is an ενέργεια, or activity. Even its xation by means of writing can at best be but an imper-ct preservation, and one which, in every instance, needs a ring intervention to resuscitate it. And this energy, or eneral faculty of speech, is not an isolated power, but the ıtire man in the totality of his powers, as far as the latter e required or concerned in the production of speech.†

The most general and characteristic function of lan-ıage is that it is a medium or link of communication. constitutes, in the first place, the connecting link tween the finite and the infinite nature of man. It bears e imprint of the double nature of man blended into a mbol. In language our spontaneity and receptivity act gether, and the subjective unites itself with the objective. y the act of speech the external world becomes converted to an internal one; and it is thus that nature, its individual jects as well as the laws by which we conceive it regu-ted, becomes translated into something that is human. anguage is thus a perpetual prosopopœia. As the iso-ted sound establishes a relation between the object and ırselves, so language, as a totality, constitutes a medium tween us and nature, as the latter produces its impressions ı us either from without or from within. It is an intellect-

* *Werke*, vol. ii., p. 240; vol. iii., p. 253; vol. vi., p. 428; vol. vii., p. 336.
† *Werke*, vol. vi., pp. 40 and 42. *Einleitung*, p. 304. (The paging of *Einlei-ng* is here invariably that of *Werke*. vol. vi.)

ual world linked to sounds, and occupies a sort of middle ground between man and the external; and it not only represents objects to the mind's eye, but it also gives us the impression produced by them, thus blending and uniting our receptivity with the self-determining, active energy of our being.* In like manner, language is a medium of communication between one individual and another, between the individual and his nation, between the past and present. The life from which it emanates breathes its living sound into the sense receiving it. In general, speech can only be conceived of as the joint product of simultaneous co-operation, in which every one is obliged to bear at once his own labor and that of all the rest.† Understanding and speaking are thus only different effects of one and the same cause, and this is none other than the capacity of speech essential to both. In him who understands, as well as in the speaker, the subject-matter must be evolved from his own inward power; and what the former receives is only an incitement in harmony with that which he himself can and is expected to impart.

It is this phase of reciprocal activity which, more than anything else, establishes the purely human nature and origin of language; and it is this, too, which offers us the best solution for the antinomies presented to us in the manifestations of speech. For, in the first place, language is never the work of an individual, but invariably the property of the entire nation, while at the same time it is always destined to serve as an instrument to the greatest imaginable diversity of individuals. It thus contains the double quality of differentiating itself, as one language, into an indefinite number of others, and of again integrating all these into one, as mere modifications of itself. Language is, in the second place, a perpetual genesis, and its very essence consists in the act of speaking, or in speech. Yet this constantly recurring process does not constitute the whole of it, and it contains also something that is permanent and firm. It produces within itself a stock of words and a system of rules, through which, in the course of centuries, it grows up into an independent power, and it thus becomes something more than the evanescent process of speaking; it establishes itself, at the same time, as the result of a multitude of previous acts of speech. This apparent contradiction constitutes the

Einleitung, pp. 53, 59. *Werke*, vol. vi., p. 530. † *Einleitung*, p. 53. *Werke*, vol. iii., p. 18.

peculiarity of language. It is in its very nature passive and active, subjective and objective, at the same time.

Both these antinomies are accounted for completely by the human character and origin of language. For, in the first place, individual speaking is linked to the speaking of the nation, and the speaking of nations to speech in general, which has its centre in the common bond and unity of our nature. For man does not possess any such thing as an absolutely isolated individuality; the I and the Thou are the essential complements of each other, and would, in their last analysis, be found identical. In this sense there are circles of individuality from each weak, helpless, and perishable member of our race as far back as the time of our hoariest antiquity. Without this, says Humboldt, no such thing as interchange of thought, or even comprehension, would ever have been possible.* So, in respect to the second antinomy, the apparent contradiction involved in the activity and passivity of speech, Humboldt again finds it accounted for in the unity of human nature already spoken of. "In that which originates in something which is properly identical with myself, the distinction of subject and object, of dependence and independence, becomes obliterated. Whatever there is in language, traditional and established, determining and limiting me, can come from no other than a human source, and one that is most intimately connected with myself; hence, even that which is strange and unintelligible to me in human speech can be so only to my momentary individual nature, and not to my original or real one."† By thus referring our ability to speak and understand to a universal element common to all the members of the race, Humboldt moves it to the point where the vestiges of its human origin become blended with the divine, as far as man, in virtue of his intellectual and moral nature, can claim himself akin to the Divinity, and this is the only sense in which to him the question of a divine origin can have any scientific value or significance.

After this brief outline of Humboldt's views concerning the origin and general nature of human language, it is now in order to give a cursory survey of his further attempts to analyze the process of speech as exhibited in its constitutive elements, in articulation, the formation of roots, words, and grammatical forms, with their mutual relation and dependence on each other.

---

* Schlegel's *Museum*, vol. ii., p. 498. † *Werke*, vol. vi., p 65.

The process of speech being, as we have already seen, based upon the rational instinct, it is, first of all, necessary to inquire into the manner in which this instinct acts in the process in question. We have, in the first place, to answer that the action of this process can only be explained, as far as it is susceptible of explanation, in connection with the necessary mechanism of our intellectual life. When brought in contact with the external world, the activity of our senses unites itself synthetically with an internal act of the mind, and this joint operation gives rise to sensation. From the confused mass of our sensations another process, similar to the first, gives rise to perception, and when a perception isolates itself, it assumes the character of objectivity in reference to the mind and becomes a conception. Now, the process of speech is so closely linked to this process of the intellect and senses, that the one cannot be said to be complete without the other. The conversion of a perception into a conception, *i. e.*, into something objective, which may be re-admitted into the mind and reflected upon, presupposes already the use of speech. "In speech," says Humboldt, "our intellectual life makes way for itself through the lips, and the product of this operation is instantaneously and first of all returned to our own ear. The indistinct process of intellection gathers itself together into a word, as light clouds are wont to collect on the clear sky." It is through speech that man represents to himself, as to another Me, the varied phenomena of the outward and the inner world, which thus become part and parcel of his consciousness. Language is thus not only the necessary channel, but the very form and body, of his intellectual activity, and may therefore be said to be identical with it. It is on this account that speech becomes indispensable even to private thinking, which, be it never so solitary, is always a sort of dialogue with our own Thou, or a soliloquy. Nevertheless, says Humboldt, language is never formed by one man only, or in solitude. On the contrary, "that objectivity of our perceptions becomes augmented when the word coined by ourselves is heard from the mouth of another." and "man cannot fully comprehend himself until he has tested the intelligibleness of his words by submitting them to others."*

Such, then, is the fundamental law which, according to Humboldt, presides over the genesis of language. We have next to enquire what he says concerning *the concrete*

* *Werke*, vol. iii., p. 18; vol. vi., p. 590; *Einleitung*, p. 53, 55.

of this activity, and concerning the constitutive elements of
His definition of this process, in so far as language
ted to mere speaking and the totality of speech, is
consists in "the perpetually reiterated labor of the
o convert the articulate sound into a fit vehicle for the
sion of thought." This labor involves two consti-
principles, of which the one is the internal aptitude
ech, and the other the external sound. It may be re-
as a species of generation, in which the inner element
ight, in order to manifest itself, has to overcome an
ment in sound. This leads us naturally to enquire,
re these two elements connected, or what is the rela-
etween thought and sound? This Humboldt main-
o be entirely beyond our comprehension. "The in-
ble connection between thought, the vocal organs, and
, as exhibited in the act of speech, is based upon an
l and unalterable arrangement of our nature, and is not
tible of any further explanation."* But, although the
ature of this connection must remain a mystery to us,
y nevertheless, by a careful observation and comparison
two elements, arrive at a certain degree of intelligence,
to perceive at least the possibility of a close internal
ny and mutual interpenetration.

the first place, there is manifestly, a certain elec-
finity and general analogy between thought and sound.
former, similar to a flash of lightning, or to a thrust,
trates the entire perceptive faculty upon a point, to
omentary exclusion of everything else, so the latter
from the lips with an abrupt distinctness and with a
degree of unity; and as the former takes hold of the
soul, so the latter possesses pre-eminently a penetrat-
wer, capable of thrilling every nerve. "In the sound
receives the impression not only of a movement, but
al act, such as is also the thinking activity itself." As
g, in its most human relations, is an aspiration from
ss to light, from the limitation of our finite being to-
the infinite, so the sound of speech flows from the
of our breasts in an outward direction, and in its pas-
nds a wonderfully adapted material medium in the
st and most easily agitated of all the elements, the air,
parent incorporeality of which is in itself to some extent
ous representative of the mind." The living sound of
ce proceeds from our breast like the very breath itself

* *Einleitung*, pp. 42, 51, 88, 304.

of our existence, and in this way communicates the life itself from which it emanates to the sense which receives it. The production of sound for the purposes of speech is aided to no small extent by the admirable arrangement of nature exhibited in the upright posture of man, from which the rest of the animals are excluded, and which almost seems to be the result of the elevating power of speech. For the latter does not want to lose itself blunted upon the ground; it requires free passage from the lips of the speaker to the one addressed, to be accompanied by the expression of the eye and of the countenance, or as by the gestures of the hand, and thus to surround itself simultaneously with everything that characterizes man distinctively as such.*

The second and still more manifest analogy between thought and sound is found in the phenomenon of *articulation*. The organic concatenation and mutual dependence of parts involved in this phenomenon constitute the essence of speech, which contains nothing that might not in its turn be either a part or the whole. Articulation properly belongs to the inward operations of the mind as well as to the outward process of speech; it contains the point of contact at which the requirements of thought and the adaptedness of sound meet each other, and it is their contact at this point that gives rise to language. The articulation of the sound, contains the thought-forming property of speech, while that of thought contains its power to convert sounds into language. As, in the process of intellection, the mind at first divides an indefinite mass of sensations into elements or parts, which it then again strives to combine into something more general, or into a whole, so the organs of speech proceed with sound, which they at once separate and unite. They thus become the executors of the articulating power of the mind, while the latter possesses the passive property of suffering itself to be converted into articulated sound. Articulation is, therefore, the connecting link between thought and sound, and it contains the possibility of speech. That this is really so we learn even where one of the elements is wanting in the deaf-mute, who, in virtue of this intimate connection between the process of intellection and the organs of speech, learns to decipher the thoughts of another from the mere movement of his lips. An exact definition of the articulated sound cannot be given, except so far as its general characteristics coincide with those of the articulating activity of the

* *Einleitung*, pp. 51, 52, 53.

nd, and every attempt at a merely physical description or alysis of it must prove a failure. The articulated sound, ı know, differs widely from a confused one, and from a cry, ll, shout, or shriek, which man produces in common with ıer animals. But this difference is so far from giving us y positive result that we cannot even exhaust its definition characterizing it as musically high or low, long or short, ill or dull, hard or soft. In fact, its real nature can rather observed than comprehended, and that only in connection th the idea of speech, which, through the medium of it ıerates and binds together thought and sound. Articulate ınds possess the property of eliciting ideas as soon as they ch the ear, and this because either some one of them is ıable of effecting it, or because the formation of any one them is such that it both admits and requires a number ›thers, homogeneous but specifically different, and capable being referred to determinate classes, and all of them ıpted to entering into necessary or arbitrary relations with h other.* They thus differ from mere animal sounds or sical notes solely in their design and in their susceptibility significance, or, in other words, of representing thoughts. e only general formula to which we can reduce them as a ss is that all articulated sounds belong to speech, and conely.*

Mere articulation is, however, no more than the lowest l most general condition of the production of speech, and h it we have not as yet arrived at the genesis of the stituent parts of speech called *words*. It is true that there o language without articulation, *i.e.*, without the sounds ressed by letters and syllables; but it is no less true that e is something more than bare articulation, when by ıns of words and sentences, language becomes really expression of thought. The word is, therefore, the point vhich the articulate sound, whether it consists of one ıble or the union of several, properly becomes speech. he word we for the first time meet with a real coincidence ıe unity of sound with the unity of conception essential he definition of speech. Words are thus the proper ele- ıts of speech, and they are to each other and to their lity what the individual is to his species and to the *nble* of the animated world around him. Finally, the word, ı its varied relations, is the limit up to which lan-

---

Einleitung, p. 67. *Werke*, vol. iii., p. 244; vol. vi., pp. 537, 588, 545.

guage is a self-productive and distinct operation of the human intellect.*

In an analysis of the process involved in the genesis of words we have again to distinguish the intellectual and the physical or phonetic side of it. Here the process in each direction exhibits three distinct stages, which, although always blended in practice, are yet manifestly a triple operation. The mind, in taking cognizance of the different objects which strike the outward or the inner senses, seeks, in the first place to isolate them and to comprehend them each as separate and distinct,—in other words, to form conceptions. It next endeavors to seize the analogies and differences of the individual objects, and to form more general categories to which it may refer them, as, for example, those of variety, species, genus, &c. It, lastly, either perceives or constitutes certain relations, by means of which the objects or conceptions are connected, or supposed to be connected, with each other.

Precisely so in language we find the *roots and radical parts of words* corresponding with the conception of isolated objects, and really the expression of it, however true it may be that, in the actual nexus of discourse, they rarely, of ever, appear alone or without the sign of some more general relation to speech. The intellectual act which marks the conception of an object is accompaniend by another which refers it to a determinate category of thought or speech. In other words, to the purely objective designation of an object is added a sort of subjective or logical rubrication, through which that designation becomes linked to one of the general categories of speech. The two operations combined give rise to a phonetically complete word, which then appears either as a noun, verb adjective, or other part of speech. But these words, again, and lastly, never appear isolated in discourse, which consist, of a complex and variously related tissue of thought. The phonetic expression of this third stadium of the process is found in the grammatical forms, as exhibited in case, number, person, word, tense, voice, comparison, &c.†

The question here again rises, How are the two sides of the triple operation just indicated, the phonetic and the intellectual, connected with each other, or, in other words, in what relation does the sound of a word stand to its significance? The answer is, again, that their connecting link resides in

* *Einleitung*, p. 76. *Werke*, p. 257. † *Einleitung*, pp. 75, 97, 122, 123.

tion, but here in a higher degree or power of it than production of mere letters or syllables. We have seen that the very definition and most essential of articulate sound involve a tendency to signifi- ınd it is this same general tendency which in the of the word results in a determinate signification. ɔvince in which this principle shows itself most is more especially that of the grammatical forms by ɔf which the words are correlated and connected in ɜe.

des this general process of articulation, but yet as ct consequence of it, we have to distinguish three t modes of designating objects or thoughts employed ch, and these are the *imitative*, the *symbolical*, and *ılogical*. In the imitative designation the tone or aracteristic of an object is reproduced in the word, ly as articulate sounds can be made to correspond to late ones. The two sounds are here brought into conflict with each other, and this mode is on that not exempt from a certain degree of crudity. It is exclusively confined to the names or the characteriza- ɔbjects, and generally disappears with the advancement guage. In the symbolical designation there is an imitation of some quality which the sound and ıave in common. For this purpose the objects are ɩed by sounds which, partly in themselves, partly ɔarison with others, produce an impression on the ear to that which the object itself leaves on the mind; example, the terms *stand*, *steady*, *sturdy*, *stout*, give impression of something firm, &c. This principle ɔcised great power in the primitive formation of words, effect is even visible in those indications of more gen- ıtions which have already become known to us as ɹtical forms.

ıe analogical designation, finally, the words whose ɹtions are more or less closely related are also ex- by similar sounds. There is, however, here no eference to the character inherent in the sounds ves, as there is in the symbolical designation, but the affinity or analogy of sense. The principle is, e, but a secondary one, although it has likewise tself pre-eminently prolific of results.*

Einleitung, pp. 80-85.

But not content with the enumeration of these different links between thought and sound, Humboldt, in another passage, seeks to demonstrate an additional one in a preliminary act of the mind. In making sound the representative of thought, we introduce a connection of things the nature of which does not admit of anything like real union. This heterogeneity, therefore, not unfrequently requires a third element, in which they may meet, as it were, on common ground, and which may serve them as a connecting medium. This medium, he says, is always of a sensuous nature; as, for example, in the words *understanding* and *perception*, in the former of which we associate an intellectual faculty, and in the latter an intellectual act, with the purely physical operations of standing, and seizing, and so in numerous other instances of the sort. It should therefore, be our aim, in all our etymological researches to trace this sensuous medium wherever we discover or suspect evidence of its existence, and thus to rise from the concrete terms of language to those radical intuitions and emotions by means of which each one of them, according to its peculiar genius, links together thought and sound in the production of its words. This principle, however, presupposes all the rest already named, and is only applicable in cases where the question turns on abstract terms the sense of which is what we usually call a secondary one. It, therefore, presides rather over the relationship than over the formation of words, and operates more like an auxiliary to the connection of sound and thought than like an original mediating energy.*

But however much all these analogies may serve to illustrate the obscure connection between thought and sound, after all it remains true that the intellectual and phonetic elements of speech are extremes that never can be reconciled completely, and that language, in spite of all the synthetic power inherent in it, will always remain a labor and a conflict, with its irradicable heterogeneity of thought and sound on the one side and the mutual dependence of both of them on the other. Thought can as little divorce itself from speech, says Humboldt, as man can lay aside the features of his countenance. Hence the mind perpetually strives to make itself independent of the domain of speech, and this simply because the word always is a limitation of the thoughts and emotions, which it never completely ex-

* *Einleitung*, pp. 109–111.

ı, and the nicest shades of which are often in danger
g lost or marred in the too general and more material
ıt of sound. All that it gains or saves, however, in
ruggle is always again added to the word, and this
ual antagonism, the intellectual powers being pro-
ılive, gives rise to an ever-increasing refinement of a
ge and to a greater affluence of significant expressions.*
perfect union of thought and sound, the proper and
tic interpenetration of the phonetic and intellectual
ts, constitutes the highest perfection of language, the
r the goal towards which it is ever tending, but which
er completely attains. The genesis of language in
ıt rudimentary form is an essentially synthetic process,
is process renews itself until there is a more or less
ete coincidence or balance of the two elements of
. In proportion to the success of this synthesis,
ge approximates the domain of art, of which the very
demands a complete representation of the ideal in its
ıl form. The natural result of this consummation of
ge is artistic beauty, and this, in its turn, always
utes an infallible test of its inherent general perfection.†
er this brief exposition of Humboldt's views respecting
gin and constitutive elements of speech, we now
ı to add what he says concerning some additional pro-
connected with the existence and phenomena of lan-
as, for example, its *organism*, its *form*, and *character*.
structure of a language is to its minutest fibres an
one, and everything in it is based upon analogy. As
ect emanation of a both physically and intellectually
being it partakes of the nature of everything
, in which each part can exist only through the other
whole is animated by one all-pervading principle
ıanation, it is true, is but a gradual one, but it is never-
of such a nature that the first word already contains
supposes the whole of it, and everything that belongs to
ntial properties of speech is unconsciously given at
d as the direct consequence of the faculty of speech.
ıge may be compared to an immense web, in which
art stands in a more or less distinctly visible con-
with the other, and all of them to the whole. In
ıg, from whatever point we may proceed, we never
nore than a particular part of this web, but always
tinctively in such a manner as if all the remaining

Einleitung, p. 110. † *Einleitung*, pp. 104, 108.

parts with which that one must of necessity be in harmony were present at the same time. The languages cannot be considered as mere aggregates of words; each one is a system according to which the mind links thought to sound. Each one is, lastly, also animated by a principle of organic unity. As soon as a people or a human intelligence takes in elements of speech, it must necessarily link them together into a sort of unity, although it may do so involuntarily and without becoming clearly conscious of the process, and this because, simply, we cannot conceive of the possibility either of individual thinking or of mutual comprehension without the operation of a principle like this.*

As each language constitutes on organic whole, so each is, secondly, possessed of its peculiar *individual form*. The effort of the mind to elevate articulate sound into an expression of thought operates in every language in a determinate, uniform, and constant manner. The *ensemble* of the homogeneous and permanent, considered in its connection and systematically represented, constitutes the form of a language. This form is the complete objective representation of the individual *nisus* by means of which each nation succeeds in making language the expression of its emotions and its thoughts. It can, therefore, be fully comprehended only in connection with the totality of a language, although it is no less active in each and even the minutest element of it. Commencing with the very alphabet, it manifests its regulating power through etymology until it reaches the subtlest niceties of syntax, and pervades the entire organism of the language as one of its most vital principles.†

But the province of grammatical forms is not the only one demanding the attention of the linguist. There is a higher and profounder element in language, which, however difficult it may be of exact analysis, may yet become a subject of feeling and reflection. The Sanscrit, Greek, and Latin, for example, are closely allied to each other, and exhibit on many points a striking similarity of etymological and structural organization. Nevertheless, apart from even the differences of this organization, these languages are each of them possessed of a distinctive individual *character*. There is in the history of every language an era at which it may be said to have reached its maturity of growth, that is to say, at which its general form and structure are more or less complete. A

* *Einleitung*, pp. 73, 85, 107, 113, 189, 338. *Werke*, vol. ii., p. 240; vol. iii. pp. 243, 253. *Kawi-Sprache*, vol. ii., p. 220.

† *Einleitung*, pp. 41–49.–*Kawi-Sprache*, vol. ii., p. 221.

iis point the activity of the nation rests from the production
: the language itself, and passes on to the *use* of it. The
eople at large, the teachers of the people, the poets, his-
rians, and, finally, the grammarians, now cultivate the lan-
uage and employ it for their purposes. It is the peculiar
anner in which this is done that gives rise to what we have
st designated as its character. The phenomenon, however,
nks itself directly and intimately to the very nature of a
nguage. The use of it produces, on the one hand, a feel-
g that there is something more than is directly expressed
y it, and which, under its influence, the mind has to supply;
id, on the other hand, the impulse to express, nevertheless,
suitable terms, whatever affects the mind. This feeling
d this impulse, operating in conjunction, constitute the
sis of the character of a language, which, to some extent,
rms one of the primitive features of it, although it does not
come distinctly developed until, as we have already said,
has become a more or less complete vehicle for thought.
he character of a language manifests itself in a variety of
ays. It may be observed in its etymological forms, in its
anner of forming compounds, in the signification of its
ords, in its synonyms, and, lastly, in the laws which regu-
te the construction of its syntax. It appears, however, still
ore distinctly and completely in the two grand divisions of
eech, in poetry and prose, in the culminating points of
hich language transcends its strict organic limits and
sses into the domain of art. It is at this point that the
ilosophy of language meets on common ground with that
literature and history.*

RT. III.—1. *English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. M. THACKERAY. New York: 1853.

Life and Works of Jonathan Swift. By SIR WALTER SCOTT.

Lives of the Poets. By SAMUEL JOHNSON.

Life of Joseph Addison. By MISS LUCY AIKIN.

Lectures on English Literature. By HENRY REED.

Biography of William Congreve. By LEIGH HUNT.

THE reign of Queen Anne was one of the most splendid
the annals of literature. It was the age of Addison,
e, Swift, Steele, Congreve, Bolingbroke, Prior, Gay; in

* *Einleitung*, p. 195, *seq.*

whose writings may be found all that is elegant in style, delightful in poetry, brilliant in wit, charming in humor, and beautiful in description. It was in this Augustan age that literary men began to occupy the elevated position in the world which genius and talent should always secure: Addison was appointed commissioner of appeals, secretary to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, lord of trade, and finally, under George I., one of the principal secretaries of state. Prior was gentleman of the bedchamber to King William, under-secretary of state, and ambassador to the court of France. Swift was the chief-counsellor and intimate friend of the ministers, Harley and Bolingbroke, and was raised to the dignity of dean of St. Patrick's. Steele was a commissioner of the stamp office, governor of the Royal Company of Comedians, and commissioner of forfeited estates in Scotland. Congreve was commissioner for licensing hackney coaches, and officer in the custom-house, and secretary of Jamaica.

Of all the writers that have charmed and instructed the world by their wit and genius, there is none whom we regard with such a warm, personal feeling as Addison. He was so gentle, so tender, so kind, so loving, and bore his honors so meekly, that we love the man while we admire the writer. So many gifted men write like angels and live like fiends; so many

> "Show us the steep and thorny way to heaven,
> Whilst, like puff'd and reckless libertines,
> Themselves the primrose path of dalliance tread."

But Addison's pure and virtuous life was a true and beautiful illustration of the Christian morality which he taught in his writings. All praise is due to the man who had the moral courage to stand forth as the defender of virtue in a dissolute and impure age; who proved by his own delightful works that wit is not incompatible with decency, or humor with purity. Addison's writings give a negative answer to the interrogation of Shakespeare:

> "Where is that palace, whereinto, sometimes,
> Foul things intrude not?"

For they are distinguished by a singular delicacy of sentiment and purity of language, when the contrary was the prevailing sin of the literature of his time. Addison looked upon mankind not with the devilish hatred of Swift, the sarcastic gaze of Pope, nor the laughing eyes of Steele, but with the sad, loving eyes of an angel who wept at, while

itied, the follies and vices of men. He touches their nds and weaknesses with the kind and gentle hand of a id, not with the ferocity of Swift, who tears and racks scourges them with the ingenuity of a fiend. Listen to ison's sweet singing—how much love and reverence of creature for the Creator does it not contain:

"Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale,
And nightly to the listening earth
Repeats the story of her birth:
And all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn,
Confirm the tidings as they roll,
And spread the truth from pole to pole.
What though in solemn silence all
Move round this dark terrestrial ball;
What though no real voice nor sound
Among their radiant orbs be found;
In reason's ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice,
For ever singing, as they shine,
The hand that made them is divine."

Addison commenced his literary career by publishing ral Latin poems, in imitation of Virgil, which were tly admired at the proud seats of English learning—rd and Cambridge—but they are now seldom read. He turned his attention to English poetry; he addressed verses to King William, and published a translation of of the fourth Georgic, which had the good fortune to ct the favorable notice of Dryden, who, at that time 5), occupied, without a rival, the poetical throne of Eng-. Encouraged by his success, Addison addressed a highly plimentary poem to the Lord-keeper Somers, and dedi- a Latin poem on the Peace of Ryswick to Montague, chancellor of the exchequer. The whigs were anxious list in their party the rising talent of the nation; a pen- of £300 a year was bestowed upon the young poet, and as allowed to travel. Addison spent four years on the nent. He remained a year in France, in order to per- himself in the French language. Thence he passed to , and lingered for months in those beautiful cities hal- d by religion, art, learning, genius, and song—Rome, ence, Venice, Naples, Genoa. In 1701 his pension was ped by the death of King William, and he was under the ssity of supporting himself. He became tutor to a young ish traveller, with whom he journeyed through Switzer-

land and Germany, and, after passing a short time in Holland, returned to England in 1703.

Addison was now in his thirty-second year, without a profession and without an income, and for several months this most accomplished gentleman and scholar was compelled to hide his poverty and distress in a garret. A brighter day, however, was soon to dawn upon the fortunes of the poet. Marlborough gained the splendid victory of Blenheim. A poet was wanted who could properly celebrate this great event. Godolphin, the lord-treasurer, did not know where to find such a poet. He applied to Addison's friend and former patron, Montague, now Lord Halifax, and Halifax recommended Addison. The needy poet was very glad of such an opportunity to improve his condition, and readily undertook the proposed task. He wrote *The Campaign*, and his fortune was made; he was immediately rewarded by being made commissioner of appeals, with the promise of greater favors.

As a poet, Addison does not occupy a place in the first, or even in the second rank. Some of his poetical compositions, "The Campaign," for instance, contains fine passages and striking similes, and his poetry, like all his other writings, is pure and polished, but it wants vigor and fervor; it is too cold, too correctly classic; he loved the ancient poets too well, and imitated them too closely. Posterity has not bestowed upon his poetry the same meed of praise that it received during his life, and if he had written nothing but poems, the name of Addison would be scarcely remembered at the present day.

Soon after "The Campaign" appeared, he published the Narrative of his Travels through Italy. Like that of all his writings, the style is easy and elegant, but the book is overloaded with quotations from the Roman poets and crowded with allusions to classical fables unknown except to the learned few, and, therefore, uninteresting to the unlearned many. Addison was now rapidly mounting the ladder of fame and fortune. In 1708 the whigs obtained the entire control of the government, and Addison came in for a share of the spoils. He entered parliament, and in less than ten years became successively under secretary of state, chief secretary for Ireland, and secretary of state. In 1709, when he was in Ireland, an event occurred which was destined in the end to establish his reputation as one of the most delightful writers of all time. In the spring of this year Steele started the Tattler. The aim of the latter,

blication of this paper, was to amuse the town with hionable gossip, compliments to noted beauties, criti- on popular preachers, foreign news, accounts of new and the literary gossip of Will's and the Grecian cof- ıses, which at that time were most frequented by the Steele was well qualified to conduct such a paper. ıew the world much better than books. He had amiliarly with all sorts of people—soldiers, authors, courtiers, wits, men and women of fashion, lords dies. He was at home everywhere—in the queen's and in the club-house; in my lady's drawing- and in the guard-room; in the coffee-house and in ongeing-house. He paid dear for his knowledge. He ways sinning and always repenting. He was always t, and always promising to pay his debts. He loved fe with the tenderest affection, yet he would often de- ɛr to spend the night with his wild friends at the tavern. ote beautifully in praise of virtue, but seldom practised wn teachings. He published a book called "The ian Hero," full of the prettiest precepts of morality, his boon companions were the fastest fellows of the officers of the guards, gay young lords, and men of re of every kind and degree.

ıe Tattler was very well received. The court, the and the country hailed with delight the advent of so nt a visitor. Steele had not consulted his friend Addi- ıout the matter, but as soon as Addison discovered that ıs the editor, he determined to give it his assistance. s assistance Steele says: "I fared like a distressed who calls in a powerful neighbor to his aid. I was e by my auxiliary. When I had once called him in, I not subsist without dependence on him." This was true, for Addison's superior genius soon hid the lesser of Steele. The best papers in the Tattler, Specta- nd Guardian were written by Addison. To him we ıdebted for those delightful creations, Sir Roger de ley and Will Honeycomb, so full of exquisite humor. m we are indebted for those beautiful descriptions of and immortality, the Visits to Westminster Abbey, the ı of Mirza, and the Journal of the Retired Citizen. No ling author had written the English language with such ness, grace, and ease. No succeeding author has ex- him in delicate wit, in charming humor, in happy but ess satire. His writings display the easy, well-bred air entleman, the elegance of a scholar, and the pure mor-

ality of a Christian. As an essay writer, Addison has had many imitators, but no equals. This is high praise if we consider that such distinguished writers as Johnson, Goldsmith, Chesterfield, and Mackenzie have attempted this kind of literary composition. In the year 1713 the fame of Addison was greatly increased by his play of "Cato."

> "Envy itself was dumb—in wonder lost;
> And factions strove who should applaud him most."

Pope said: "Cato was not so much the wonder of Rome in his days as he is of Britain in ours."* It was performed for a whole month to overflowing houses. The town was in raptures. The name of Addison, the great Mr. Addison as he was called, was in every mouth. Complimentary verses were addressed to him from the universities and by the wits of the city. This contemporary admiration has not been continued by posterity. Cato is now scarcely acted and seldom read. The lofty declamations of Cato, who would not survive the ruin of his country, sounded, no doubt, very grand in the mouth of the actor; "the virtuous Marcia, towers above her sex," but it is with the coldness of a vestal virgin, not with the fire and glow and passion of a Roman lady. The characters are Romans only in name. Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Massinger, and Beaumont, says a modern writer,† have shown us Roman passions, Roman patriotism, and Roman language; these frigid abstractions (in Cato) bear the same relation to the Romans of Shakespeare, or the Roman of Rome, as the waxen dolls in the window of a barber to the living, moving, thinking passengers who walk by them in the street. Only two or three quotations from this once famous play are familiar to the readers of the present day. The following are the most known:

> "Big with the fate
> Of Cato and of Rome."
>
> "My voice is still for war."
> "Plato, thou reasonest well."
> "'Tis not in mortals to command success,
> But we'll do more, Sempronius, we'll deserve it."
> "When vice prevails, and impious men bear sway,
> The post of honor is a private station."

In the reign of Queen Anne the coffee-houses were the favorite resorts of the wits. Here they met to discuss the

* Letter to Sir W. Trumbull.
† Thomas B. Shaw, English Literature, p. 242.

news of the court, the city, and the continent. Here the last poem was read and the last play criticised. When Addison became distinguished as an author and statesman, he established his literary court at Button's coffee-house. Here his "little senate" of wits assembled, Steele, Budgell, Tickell, Phillips, and other devoted followers to do homage at the feet of their beloved sovereign. In this congenial society, Addison was perfectly at home, for he was not a lady's man, but, as Macaulay says, essentially a *man's-man*. Surrounded thus by his favorite friends, he would open his accumulated stores of wit, humor, and learning, and often, by his eloquent talk, hold them spell-bound until morning. Those who had listened to Addison's familiar conversation declared that it was even more delightful than his writings. Pope, with whom Addison was no great favorite, said there was a charm in his talk which could be found nowhere else. The celebrated Mary Wortley Montagu, who had known all the most brilliant wits of her time, said that Addison was the best company in the world. But Addison's extraordinary conversational powers were only displayed in the company of his intimate friends. In the presence of strangers, his eloquent lips were sealed, and his manners became constrained and embarrassed; no one who met him in large companies would have believed that he was the same man who had often kept a few friends out of their beds until four o'clock in the morning by his fascinating conversation.

One of the acutest judges of literature of our time, who seldom bestows undeserved praise, says that we owe as much pleasure to Addison as to any human being that ever wrote. He came in that artificial age, and began to speak with his noble, natural voice. He came, the gentle satirist, who hit no unfair blow; the kind judge, who castigated only in smiling. Johnson concludes an elaborate criticism on Addison in the following words: "His sentences have neither studied amplitude nor affected brevity; his periods, though not diligently rounded, are voluble and easy. Whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison." There is no name in the history of literature more enviable than Addison's—a prosperous and beautiful life, a happy death, and a glorious fame forever.

---

* Thackeray, "Humorists of the Eighteenth Century," lec., on Addison.

In the crowd of ambitious youths that surrounded Addison at Button's coffee-house, for about a year, was Alexander Pope. At an age when most youths have not thrown aside their tops and balls, Pope's young genius was preparing to wing its lofty flight; already he aspired to the poetical crown, which, since the death of Dryden, in 1700, no one had been deemed worthy to wear. In the year 1711 Pope established his reputation as the first poet of his age, and indeed of the eighteenth century, by publishing his "Essay on Criticism." This finished and elegant poem, the work of a young man of twenty-one or two, displays a ripe judgment, an extensive reading, and deep reflection far beyond his age. It was received with a burst of admiration, and, by universal consent, the laurel crown was placed upon his youthful brow. He soon after greatly added to his fame by that delicious little poem, "The Rape of the Lock," which has been justly pronounced * the most faultless work of England's most faultless poet. It is, indeed, the most perfect piece of poetry in our language. In no other work has Pope so pleasingly displayed the peculiar marks of his genius: a rich and brilliant fancy, an exquisite polish of language, and a musical sweetness of versification.

The description of the heroine is beyond all praise:

"Fair nymphs and well dress'd youths around her shone,
But every eye was fix'd on her alone.
On her white breast a sparkling cross she wore,
Which Jews might kiss and infidels adore;
Her lively looks a sprightly mind disclose,
Quick as her eyes, and as unfix'd as those:
Favors to none, to all she smiles extends;
Oft she rejects, but never once offends;
Bright as the sun, her eyes the gazers strike,
And, like the sun, they shine on all alike.
Yet graceful ease, and sweetness void of pride
Might hide her faults, if belles had faults to hide.
If to her share some female follies fall,
Look on her face, and you'll forget them all."

The rising glory of Pope began to dim the poetical reputation of Addison, just as, a hundred years later, the splendid genius of Byron caused Scott "to pale his ineffectual fires," and, fortunately for the world, to turn his attention to romantic fiction, in which he stands almost unrivalled. But Addison had reigned and ruled too long to allow a "brother near his throne." He, who had few equals, could

* Horace Binney Wallace, "Literary Criticisms."

ot bear a superior; and he, who felt himself a sovereign, ould not remain a subject; and so the greatest poet and he greatest prose-writer of their age separated. Pope set p a rival court at Twickenham, a charming retreat on the anks of the Thames. Here he received the visits of his riends, who were among the most brilliant, the most polished, he most accomplished gentlemen that the world has ever seen. hey were great and celebrated in their day and generation, nd are still remembered: Arbuthnot, one of the wittiest, risest, gentlest of mankind; the all-accomplished Bolingroke, the Alcibiades of his age; the generous Oxford; the reat painter, Sir Godfrey Kneller; the witty, the dashing, he magnificent Peterborough; the splendid Congreve; the ind, the indolent, the gentle Gay. Some of this delightful ompany Pope has described in sparkling verse:

"Granville the polite
And knowing Walsh would tell me I could write;
Well-natured Garth inflamed with early praise,
And Congreve loved, and Swift endured, my lays.
The courtly Talbot, Somers, Sheffield, read,
Even mitred Rochester would nod the head;
And St. John's self (great Dryden's friend before)
With open arms received one poet more.
Happy my studies when by these approved!
Happier their author when by these beloved!"

In the year 1713, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, Pope commenced, and in twelve years completed, the olossal task of translating the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer. This splendid literary performance Johnson* pronounces "a poetical wonder which no age or nation can pretend to equal." Had Pope written nothing else, this alone would have rendered his name immortal. It has not, indeed, the noble simplicity, the artless grandeur, and unaffected majesty of the great Father of Poetry; but we have the authority of Johnson† for saying that it contains a treasure of poetical elegances. It overflows with rich, beautiful, and vivid descriptions of men, gods, nature, and battles, all expressed in the most pleasing and musical language. While Pope was occupied with this gigantic labor, he learned that Addison's friend and *protegé*, Tickell, was, with Addison's assistance, engaged upon another version of the Iliad. Pope was naturally very much concerned, for upon the success of his

* Life of Pope, p. 188, v. xi., Murphy's ed. Johnson's Works, London, 1816.
† *Idem*, p. 184.

translation depended his fortune. He had been engaged upon it for years; it had been long advertised as being in preparation; subscriptions had been solicited, and many distinguished persons had promised to take copies; and now, when everything "pointed to a rich end," Tickell came forward with a rival translation, patronized and introduced by the great Addison, and puffed up by Addison's subjects, the wits of Button's. Pope's suspicions were aroused. He thought and believed that Addison, Tickell, and their friends had formed a deep conspiracy against his fame and fortune. These suspicions were, no doubt, unjust. Addison was too pure, too good, too lofty, to stoop to such baseness, either to serve a friend or injure an enemy. But Pope need not have feared a competition with Tickell. The former was a great poet, the latter was a little one. Pope left many noble and beautiful productions of his genius, Tickell left nothing which is now remembered, except his loving tribute to the memory of Addison. Tickell's version of the first book of the Iliad was published and soon forgotten. Pope's splendid translation lives, and will continue to live as long as the English language.

While Pope was still persuaded that Addison had endeavored to undermine his reputation, and, in consequence, his feelings towards Addison were anything but warm, a pamphlet appeared containing some reflections upon Pope. The latter was morbidly sensitive. He was small, sickly, and dreadfully deformed—a great and brilliant mind in a weak and diseased body—and was lampooned, caricatured, and insulted by his enemies on account of these bodily defects.

What were the reflections contained in this pamphlet, whether personal or not, we can never learn, for it is no longer in existence; but whatever they were, they stung the sensitive soul of Pope to the quick. He was told by the young Earl of Warwick, son of the noble lady whom Addison afterwards married, that the pamphlet had been written by Addison's direction. Pope was furious. In his anger, he wrote that most exquisite and most polished piece of satire, addressed to Addison under the name of Atticus. For pointed and piercing wit, and refined and delicate irony, these lines are unsurpassed in any language:

> "And were there one whose fires
> True genius kindles and fair fame inspires,
> Blest with each talent and each art to please,
> And born to write, converse, and live with ease;
> Should such a man, too fond to rule alone,

Bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne;
View him with scornful yet with jealous eyes,
And hate for arts that caused himself to rise;
Damn with false praise, assent with civil leer,
And, without sneering, teach the rest to sneer;
Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a fall, and hesitate dislike;
Alike reserved to blame as to commend,
A timorous foe and a suspicious friend;
Dreading even fools, by flatterers besieged,
And so obliging that he ne'er obliged;
Like Cato, gives his little senate laws,
And sits attentive to his own applause;
While wits and templars every sentence raise,
And wonder with a foolish face of praise;
Who but must laugh if such a man there be,
Who would not weep if Atticus were he?"

"I sent the verses to Mr. Addison," said Pope, "and used me very civilly ever after; and never did me any istice, that I know of, from that time to his death, which about three years after."

Pope's triumph was now complete, and he might have ed content with the laurels that he had already won. But years he had been subject to the malignant attacks of a de of miserable scribblers, who, from their Grub-street rets, threw dirt and foul things upon the greatest of living ts. They ridiculed his puny person; they called him names; they laughed at his personal defects; they austed the vocabulary of abuse in heaping insults upon devoted head of the little giant of literature. Was this enough to make a savage misanthrope of him—to embitter so that, like Lot's wife, he became "a pillar of salt?" he did not, like the most famous poet of the present tury, pour forth his misanthropy in eloquent curses against God that made him. He did not write volumes of mag-ent poetry to tell the world that he was the most miser-e of men. He did not call heaven and earth to witness, ines of transcendent beauty, that life was a burden and th would be a release. He determined to take a sweeping nge, and, like Cæsar Borgia, crush all his enemies with a le blow. He knew his power. He knew that he had a it mind in a feeble body, and he determined to use his ngth like a giant. He wrote the Dunciad. In richness deas, in strength of diction, and in intensity of feeling, production surpasses all that Pope had previously done, is perhaps the finest specimen of literary satire which its in any language. The whole vocabulary of irony is

exhausted; the whole universe of contempt is ransacked. We find the combined merits of the most dissimilar satirists—the wild, fearless, inventive, picturesque, extravagance of Aristophanes, the bitter irony and cold sarcasm of Lucian, the elegant raillery of Horace, and Juvenal's strange union of moral severity and grim pleasantry. It is curious to read these brilliant records of literary animosity, and to reflect upon the unenviable immortality which Pope's genius has conferred upon the meanest of scribblers and the most despicable of pamphleteers. Like the straws, the empty shells, and excrements of dead animals which the lava has preserved for uncounted centuries, and in which the eye of the geologist beholds the records of past convulsions, these names have been preserved uninjured through a period of time when many things a thousand times more valuable have perished forever; and they exist, and will continue to exist, as long as the English language shall endure, imperishable but valueless memorials—the trash of literature, vitrified by the lightning of indignant genius.*

This ferocious satire was received by the Dunces with a howl of indignation. They resolved upon revenge. They threatened Pope with personal violence, and, for a time, his life was in danger. They wrote pamphlets more abusive than ever, and published caricatures which must have tortured and torn the delicate and exquisitely sensitive soul of Pope. In a new edition of the Dunciad, published in 1742, Pope dethroned Theobald, the original King of the Dunces, and placed Colley Cibber on that "bad eminence." A perpetual war, in which no quarter was given on either side, was declared between the King of the Dunces and the King of the Satirists. Cibber answered Pope's satire with a pamphlet, in which he declares his resolution from that time never to bear another blow without returning it, and to tire out his adversary by perseverance, if he cannot conquer him by strength. Pope pretended to be amused by the attempts of Cibber; but it is related by the son of Richardson the painter, that he attended his father on a visit to Pope, when one of Cibber's pamphlets was put into the hands of the poet, who said, "these things are my diversion." They sat by him while he perused it, and saw his features writhing with anguish; and young Richardson said to his father, on their return, that he hoped to be preserved from such diversion as had been that day the lot of Pope.

* Shaw's English Literature, p. 221.

etween the years 1733 and 1740, Pope gave to the
l his Epistles, Satires, and Moral Essays, addressed for
most part to his distinguished friends Bolingbroke,
thnot, &c. These admirable compositions, considered
ately, are in most cases directed against some prevail-
rice or folly, and it is perhaps in them that the poet's
is is seen in its fullest splendor. Glowing with fancy
a rich profuseness of illustration, adorned with every
dor that art or industry could confer, they are noble
mperishable monuments of knowledge, of acuteness, of
vation, of finish, and of facility; for the poet had now
ied that mastery in his art when the very elaboration
ie workmanship is concealed in the apparent ease of
xecution. They abound in happy strokes of description,
quisite appropriateness of phrase, and a thousand pas-
from these charming compositions have passed into the
ary conversation of those who speak the poet's language.
, with his whole soul, loved what is good and true, and
his whole soul hated what is evil and false. Who has
read and admired the noble and beautiful lines with
h the Dunciad concludes?

"She comes, she comes! the sable throne behold!
Of night primeval and of Chaos old;
Before her, Fancy's gilded clouds decay,
And all its varying rainbows die away,
Wit shoots in vain its momentary fires,
The meteor drops, and in a flash expires.
As one by one, at dread Medea's strain,
The sick'ning stars fade off the ethereal plain;
As Argus' eye, by Hermes' wand oppress'd,
Closed one by one to everlasting rest;—
Thus, at her fell approach and secret might,
Art after art goes out, and all is night.
See skulking Faith to her old cavern fled,
Mountains of casuistry heaped o'er her head;
Philosophy, that leaned on heaven before,
Shrinks to her second cause and is no more.
Religion, blushing, veils her sacred fires,
And, unawares, Morality expires.
No public flame, nor private, dares to shine,
Nor human spark is left, nor glimpse divine.
Lo! thy dread empire, Chaos, is restored.
Light dies before thy uncreating word;
Thy hand, great Anarch, lets the curtain fall,
And universal darkness buries all!"

n these astonishing lines, Pope reaches to the very
test height which his sublime art has attained, and
vs himself the equal of all poets of all times. It is the

brightest ardor, the loftiest assertion of truth, the most generous wisdom, illustrated by the noblest poetic figure, and spoken in words the aptest, grandest, and most harmonious. It is heroic courage speaking: a splendid declaration of righteous wrath and war. It is the gage flung down, and the silver trumpet ringing defiance to falsehood and tyranny, deceit and dulness.*

The most brilliant wit, the most superb dandy, the most gallant and agreeable gentleman, and the greatest literary "swell" of this age of wits, was William Congreve. He first became known as an author by the comedy of the "Old Bachelor," which was written before he was twenty years old, and which had the good fortune of securing for him the patronage of generous Halifax, who bestowed upon him several lucrative places under the government. Johnson, one of the severest of critics, says of this comedy: "The dialogue is quick and sparkling, the incidents such as seize the attention, and the wit so exuberant that it o'er-informs its tenement." The brilliant young wit took the world by storm. Everybody acknowledged the successful chieftain. Dryden, the greatest literary character of his day, and himself the centre of a circle of wits, writes of him: "Mr. Congreve has done me the favor to review the Nereis, and compare my version with the original. I shall never be ashamed to own that this excellent young man has shown me many faults, which I have endeavored to correct." Pope dedicated his Illiad to him in an address of great beauty, and highly complimentary. Addison, Steele, Swift, and all the wits acknowledged his talents, and showered praises upon him. Voltaire, during his visit to England, called upon him, as one of the leaders of literature. Thackeray says: "The ladies loved him, and he was no doubt a pretty fellow." Lady Mary Wortley Montagu said she never knew anybody that had so much wit as Congreve. He won his laurels with the easy and elegant grace of a gentleman-soldier of the household troop of Louis XIV.—in velvet slippers, flowing wig, and laced coat. His comedies are bright, witty, and brilliant, but the less they are read the better for the reader. Fortunately the world grows better as it grows older, and the comedies of Congreve, once the delight of the most polished society in England, would not now be tolerated in any society. Some of his verses may give an idea of his

* Thackeray's "English Humorists," Lecture on Pope.

grace, his elegance in compliment, his exquisite sarcasms. He writes thus of a young lady at a fashionable watering-place of that day:

"Cease, cease to ask her name,
The crowned muse's noblest theme,
Whose glory by immortal fame
Shall only sounded be.

But if you long to know,
Then look round yonder dazzling row,
Who most does like an angel show
You may be sure 'tis she."

Here are some rather severe lines upon another beauty:

"When Lesbia first I saw, so heavenly fair,
With eyes so bright and with that awful air,
I thought my heart would durst so high aspire,
As bold as his who snatched celestial fire.
But soon as e'er the beauteous idiot spoke
Forth from her coral lips such folly broke;
Like balm the trickling nonsense heal'd my wound,
And what her eyes enthralled her tongue unbound."

We now come to the greatest wit of the age of Queen Anne, if not the greatest wit of all times—Dean Swift. This famous writer, like Steele, Sterne, Sheridan, Goldsmith, and Burke, was an Irishman by birth. In his youth he was poor but proud, ambitious but obscure. He was educated by the kindness of an uncle, whom he hated for not doing more for him than he was able. When he was twenty-one years old he entered the service of Sir William Temple as private secretary. He received a salary of £20 a year, and a place at the upper servants' table. With a spirit as proud as Lucifer's, and a genius vast and mighty, Swift was compelled to bow with humble respect before his patron, and listen to his tiresome and oft-repeated stories. But, it was while occupying his dependent position that Swift laid the foundation of his literary fame: he had access to Sir William's valuable library, and availed himself of it to accumulate the vast stores of knowledge which he afterwards used so well in his writings. Swift was one of those flowers that bloom late; he was thirty-four when his first book was published. This may account for the extraordinary vigor and mastery of style which distinguished his writings from the beginning. They display none of the glitter and tinsel of rhetoric; they possess neither the delicate and exquisite humor of Addison, the dazzling brilliancy of Pope, the splendidly harmonious periods of Bolingbroke, nor the dashing gaiety of Steele. His

strength was in his keen and crushing wit, his withering and merciless satire. Wit and satire were his weapons—his two-edged sword, with which he destroyed his enemies and defended his friends. These mighty weapons raised him from obscurity and penury to fame and competence, from dependence and servitude to the companionship of the noble and great.

Swift commenced his political career as a whig, but in 1708 became dissatisfied with that party, and joined the tories, and was soon writing as vigorously and as fluently for his new friends as he had done for his former patrons. He was courted and caressed by Oxford and Bolingbroke, for they wanted the aid of his matchless wit. Dr. Johnson says* that Swift for a time dictated the political opinions of the English nation. He was the real ruler of England. He wrote pamphlets, poems, lampoons, and letters against the opposition; his tremendous wit and dreadful satire was the chief support of the government. They rewarded his important services with approving smiles and flattering familiarity. But when he looked for a bishopric, they had none to give him. The queen and her advisers would not confer the mitre on the author of such a book as "The Tale of a Tub," whose boon companions were free-thinkers and infidels, whose books were loaded with a disgusting indecency which would have shamed the dissolute Wharton.

With all his great genius, with all his incomparable wit, with all his extraordinary talents, Swift fails to command our respect. This remorseless satirist, this Lucifer of Literature, was more feared than loved by all his acquaintance, except Pope, Bolingbroke, and one or two more of his particular friends. It seems strange that such a man as Swift, a cold, gloomy, misanthrope, could have won the devoted and enthusiastic love of two such women as Vanessa and Stella, one the most accomplished, the other the most beautiful woman of her age. His cruel selfishness caused one of them to die of a broken heart, and the other to suffer a long, lingering misery.

The greatest production of the genius of Swift, and one of the most remarkable books ever written, is "Gulliver's Travels." Being a work of universal satire, it will be read as long as the corruptions of human nature renders its innumerable mimic and sarcastic strokes applica-

* Life of Swift.

ble and intelligible to human beings; and even were the follies and baseness of humanity so far purged away that men should no longer need the sharp and bitter medicine of satire, it would still be read with little less admiration and delight for the wonderful richness of invention it displays, and the exquisite art with which the most impossible and extravagant adventures are related—related so naturally as to cheat us into a momentary belief in their reality. Swift was indeed a rarely gifted, prompt, and vigorous intellect; in his particular line of satire he is unequalled in literature; he did more, and more readily, what few besides him could have attempted; he played during his life a prominent and important part in the political drama of his country; and established himself by his writings among the prose classics of the world; but he was, as a man, heartless, selfish, unloving, and unsympathizing; as a writer, he degraded and lowered our reverence for the divinity of our nature; and as a statesman, he appears to have felt no nobler spur to the exertion of his gigantic powers than the sting of personal pique and the pang of disappointed ambition. Throughout the whole of his literary career, Swift never appears to have cared to obtain the reputation of a mere writer. The ruling passion of his mind was an intense and arrogant desire for political power and notoriety; as he himself says, "All my endeavors, from a boy, to distinguish myself, were only for the want of a great title, that I might be used like a lord by those who have an opinion of my parts—whether right or wrong it is no great matter."[a] His was a great, an immense, but an evil genius:

> "Less than archangel ruined, and the excess
> Of glory obscured."

We are done. Time does not permit us to say anything of Bolingbroke, whose stately and harmonious diction cannot be too highly commended, but whose infidel and atheistical sentiments cannot be too highly condemned; of Prior, so honored and celebrated in his day; and of Gay, the favorite of all the wits of the age of Queen Anne.

---

[a] English Literature, by Thomas B. Shaw, p. 229.

ART. IV.—1. *Reports of various Trials in the principal Cities of the United States, from* 1855 *to* 1865.

2. *Women as they are, or the Manners of the Day.* By Mrs. GORE. London.

3. *Privileges of Women.* By JONAH S. MARSTON. London.

4. *The Poisoners of the Seventeenth Century.* Edinburgh.

5. *Remarkable Female Criminals.* London.

6. *Des Femmes avant le mariage, pendant le mariage et apres le mariage.* Paris.

THERE is nothing in which Americans differ from other enlightened nations more than in their treatment of woman. In general the comparison is in our favor; so far as our intentions are concerned, it is so in nearly all respects; but in certain circumstances none more grievously err. The sex cannot be too much respected; a country in which they are not highly respected cannot be said to be highly enlightened. But the difficulty with us is that we are too indiscriminate in our respect; not only do we call them all "ladies," but we claim for the good, bad and indifferent the same privileges, and the same immunities. This is wrong and unjust; its tendency, instead of being salutary, is pernicious.

It is but a spurious gallantry that allows a woman to do what she likes with impunity merely because she is a woman; nor is it by any means a characteristic of a high civilization, as it is generally supposed. In no state of society is woman allowed more liberty than in the barbarous or semi-barbarous; and in no state of society is her husband more controlled by her. Even in countries where polygamy is established, the power of the favorite wife to do harm, by her influence on her husband, is proportioned to the degree of intelligence and enlightenment possessed by the latter, and *vice versa*.

There is no more interesting or instructive chapter in M. Guizot's admirable work on "Civilization in Europe" than that in which he shows from various authorities, ancient and modern, that in the primitive state of society woman is regarded as possessed of supernatural power, and reverenced accordingly as a superior being. That, in general, she is worse treated by her husband than she would be likely to be in an enlightened state of society does not alter the fact. The ancient Germans of the time of Tacitus consulted their wives much more than their enlightened descendants do at the

present day; nay, the Gallic women of the time of Cæsar had more control over their husbands than the French women have at the present day. But neither race were indiscriminate in their respect or esteem; they made a wide distinction between the good and the bad, the worthy and the unworthy. While they dignified the former with titles, and allowed them to take part in their public deliberations, they inflicted on the latter all gradations of punishment, including that of death, according to the character of the crimes of which they were proved guilty.

We will take some pains with this branch of our subject, because most of those jurors who think they ought to acquit a woman, no matter how revolting is the crime she has committed; no matter how much she has disgraced her own sex; do so under the impression that they exhibit superior enlightenment. It is, perhaps, reasonable enough that it is those who claim to be most in favor of what is called "woman's rights" that are the first to raise shouts of triumph when a woman is acquitted under any circumstances. Whether they may be sincere or not in this exultation is but a secondary consideration; in either case they are the enemies rather than the friends of the sex, simply because the tendency of their course is to degrade them. That they call themselves reformers, and in some instances really believe they are, is no more than might be expected; but the truth is that the effect of their teachings, if successful, would be to cause society to retrograde instead of advancing. Be it remembered that not one of the rights claimed for woman, if granted to-morrow, would be new; all had been possessed before by their ancestors, but set aside as derogatory or unsuitable, according as civilization advanced. It is sometimes claimed that our wives and sisters are capable even of leading armies, and ought to be placed in such positions, the same as men, when found qualified. But the ancient Britons, made a general as well as a queen of Boadicea, at a time when they used to paint their naked bodies, as the red men do at the present day, and, unlike the red men, used to sell each other into slavery. Nor was Boadicea wanting in courage; perhaps, few male generals or kings had more. But the question at issue is not whether a woman has more courage than a man, but whether the battle-field or the camp is as suitable for her as home. It may be said that since Boadicea was a queen, what she did cannot be held to be a criterion of the course pursued in her time towards women

in general; but Tacitus tells us that the ancient Britons were wont to war under the leadership of *women*, and to make *no difference of sex* in places of command and government.*

Still more to the point, if possible, is the testimony of Cæsar, who informs us that the Britons advised with their women in matters of peace and war; and if any questions arose of difference of opinion, they were referred to their arbitration.†

Now, the most liberal of the advocates of woman's rights would hardly maintain that, if our male legislators in both houses of congress cannot agree on some important international question, they ought to refer it to their wives and daughters, and be guided by their decision. Nor did the Britons become less gallant after their subjugation by the Romans; when driven into the mountains and fastnesses of Wales, they were as favorable as ever to "woman's rights;" in short, the ancient laws of Wales allow woman more privileges than those of any other country.‡ Indeed, they overlook or omit nothing in which the interest of woman is concerned; but while thus careful in protecting her, they are not the less particular in prescribing the punishment that shall be inflicted upon her when she is guilty of crimes much less heinous than murder or homicide. In other words, the same barbarians who provided that she should not be wronged in the slightest manner with impunity, either in person or property, provided at the same time that if, like a bad man, she committed murder, like a bad man she would have to pay the penalty with her life.

If we approach nearer to our own times we shall find that precisely in proportion as civilization advanced did "woman's rights" fall into disuse, and generally with her own consent and good will. In the earlier of the Anglo-Saxon charters that are still extant the queen's signature is found beside that of the king; and for nearly two centuries after this custom ceased her name continued to be joined with that of the king in the body of the charter. Nor did she confine herself to signing her name as long as she was allowed to do so; we are informed by Turner, in his excellent "History of the Anglo-Saxons,"§ that she often sat in the witenagemot (Saxon parliament) even after she became queen dowager.

* Fœmenarum ductu bellare, et sexum in imperiis non discernere.—*Vita Agric, et ann.* 4.

† Mos inolevet ut pacis et belli cum fœminis consilia inirent. Si quæ quæ tiones cum sociis inciderent, earam arbitrio has commiterent.—*De Bell. Gall.*

‡ Vide *Leges Wallicæ.* 1, 2, *De Mulieribus.*

§ Vol. iii., p. 180.

It is not alone the queen that sometimes signed the royal charters of the Anglo-Saxons; the historians of the time inform us that abbesses did the same. Thus, in the charter of King Offa to the Abbey of Croyland, the following entry is made: "J, Ceolburgha, Abbesse of Berdea, have assented."* That the abbesses enjoyed the same rights as the abbots is evident from all the works which give any account of the privileges allowed the sex at this early period of our history. The historian already quoted tells us that the charter of King Etelwulphe was made "in the presence of, and with the subscriptions first, of the archbishops, after them of the kings of Mercia and East Angles, and an infinite number of abbots, *abbesses*, dukes, &c., and other faithful people of the land;" but he also informs us that "no lady accused of a crime was allowed any privilege by the Anglo-Saxon laws," and that "any one against whom a crime was proved, even though she were an abbesse, was not only punished as much as a man in the same circumstances, but generally more, because it was held that a woman ought not to be as evil-disposed as a man."

From the characteristic gallantry of the Normans we need hardly say that they were not illiberal in their treatment of the sex; it was they who introduced the good old English adage, "When a man reigns a woman governs, and *vice versâ*." Daniel tells us, in his "History of the Norman Kings" (p. 72), that in the reign of Edward III., Alice Perrers possessed such an ascendency that she was in the habit of sitting with the judges in Westminster Hall. Rymer mentions, with astonishment, the power she exercised.† But, great as it was, it did not secure her impunity when she violated the law; neither king, nor courtier, nor judge thought that because she was a woman she ought not to be punished when she misbehaved. We have a curious and interesting proof of this in Petyt's *Theatrum Criminalium*,‡ in which a full report is given of the proceedings in parliament against her, and in the same work there is a copy of a writ of Edward III, proclaiming that any woman who had been guilty of "*Maintenance* in causes" (receiving bribes and acting as the "lobby members" of the present day), and especially warning Alice Perrers from interfering in such matters, on pain of ignominious banishment from the kingdom. Thus

* *Ingulphus, Hist.*, p. 854.
† Vide *De nave vocata la Alice*, vol. iii., p. 188, 50th Edward III.
‡ Vol. iii., p. 188.

she had power and influence as long as she was believed to deserve them, but when found to be unworthy she was held responsible for her conduct the same as any other person.

In the reign of Henry IV., the office known as Justice of the Forrest was filled by a woman. At the coronation of that monarch, Thomas Dymocke officiated as champion in right of his mother Margaret. The Countess of Richmond, officiated for years as a justice of the peace. It is well known to every intelligent student of English history that Queen Mary commissioned Lady Bartlett a justice of the peace in Gloucester; and in the *Harleian Manuscripts* we have the additional information that the lady usually sat upon the bench among the justices, as did several other ladies, with her sword by her side (*gladio cincta*).

That women acted as military officers at the same period is beyond question. Thus, in the work last quoted, we are informed that Lady Hawis de London held the manor of Esegarston of the king, *in capite*, by *sergeanty*, as part of Kidwelby, *to conduct the vanguard of the king's army* as often as he should go into Wales with one, and in returning to bring up the rear guard.* The ladies who filled these various offices wore all the insignia belonging to them the same as men; those having military commissions not only wearing swords, but coats of mail. This habit continued up to the time of Elizabeth; even the Virgin Queen herself wore a coat of mail. That which she is said to have worn while reviewing her troops at Tilbury may still be seen in the British Museum. But this was one of the last, if not the very last, of its kind. The age of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Bacon, and Raleigh became too enlightened for this sort of woman's rights. All are aware, however, that at no time had women more power; but it is equally notorious that at no time was she punished in a more summary or severe manner. The latter fact is but too well attested by the executions of Lady Jane Grey and the Queen of Scots. That both of these celebrated but ill-fated ladies were cruelly wronged does not alter the fact that the public opinion of the day, however distinguished for its gallantry, was not at all opposed to the punishment of women when they were believed to have violated the laws.

We are here reminded of the absurd pretension that Luther was the first advocate of woman's rights; the facts we have already stated render it superfluous to take any notice of this,

* Harl. Mss., No. 2087, p. 23.

were it not that it introduces us to a circumstance which is not only interesting, but amusing, altogether independently of the question at issue. It is well known that Luther was much more concerned about his own right to have a wife than he was about any extra rights a certain class of women might claim. And not only was John Knox no advocate of woman's rights when the two Marys were on the thrones of England and Scotland respectively; no speaker or writer of any age was more zealous and unwearied in his efforts to prove that women were utterly incapable of exercising the sovereign authority. In 1564 he preached in Edinburgh before Lord Darnley, the husband of the Queen of Scots, and boldly proclaimed to the people that "for their sins and ingratitude, in encouraging popery, God had set over them boys and women." At the beginning of the reign of Philip and Mary, he published his "*First Blast on the Trumphet against the monstrous Regiment of Women.*" In this performance he maintained, with all the energy of which he was capable, that the rule of a woman was "repugnant to nature, a contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to his revealed will and approved ordinance, and, finally, the subversion of all equity and justice." This seemed somewhat strange to those who remembered that none had urged the claims of Lady Jane against Mary more zealously than John Knox. He felt persuaded that neither England nor Scotland could have a wiser sovereign than she; but no sooner is she executed than he discovers, in common with the large majority of his brethren, that no female sovereign could govern with either wisdom or justice. The "Blast" we have mentioned was only designed to be the beginning of a series; but when he had the "Second Blast" nearly finished Mary died, and was succeeded by Elizabeth. This produced another change in his views; one quite as sudden, not to say as unaccountable, as the former; he made it his business to have an early interview with Cecil, and inform him that Elizabeth formed an exception to the general rule laid down in Scripture against the women; that her whole life was a miracle, proving that she had been chosen by God; that the office, unlawful to other women, was lawful to her, &c.*

We have alluded to the pious brethren of Knox as maintaining similar opinions for and against women, according to Scripture. Another preacher named Goodman had pub-

* *Stryps*, 121.

lished "Blasts" similar to those of Knox, but he also recanted. Several preachers who were in exile for preaching such doctrines to the people chose Aylmer, one of their number, to get up a "blast" in the opposite direction, in order to propitiate Elizabeth; and in about two weeks that pious and conscientious reformer published "*An Harborowe for faithful and trewe subjects against the late blowne blast concerning the government of women*, MDLIX. *Strasborowe*, 26 *April*." Nor was this without its effect, for in about three months after its publication the author had a bishopric. When some of his friends reminded him of his former opinions, he quoted 1 Cor. xiii., 11 with the air of a saint to whom a new revelation had been made, "When I was a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

Even this brief glance will show what woman's rights and their champions were up to the time of Elizabeth. But nothing in English history is clearer than that in proportion as the nation became enlightened the so-called rights of woman diminished; but need we add that her comfort increased, or that her moral influence improved?

There is no doubt that woman had a voice in parliament for centuries. The peeresses were not such merely in name, as many authors show. Thus, for example, Joseph Holland tells us, in his *Antiquity of the Parliaments in England*, p. 47, that among the earls and barons returned to parliament in the 35th Edward III., are, "*Marie Countesse de Norfilk; Alianor Countesse de Ormone; Philipp Countesse de March; Agnes Countesse de Pembroke; and Katherine Countesse de Athell.*" For centuries the women continued to be summoned by royal writ.* And after this custom ceased the ladies still retained the privilege of sending their husbands to represent them. The evidence of this is to be found in many documents, but suffice it to mention the Dugdale MS. in the Ashmole Museum at Oxford, which contains "*A Catalogue of such Noble Persons as have had Summons to Parliament, and there sate in right of their wives.*†

Thus a peeress might marry a common squire and send

---

* The following extract from one of these writs will serve as a specimen: "Rex, etc., Mariæ Comitissiæ Norfolc, salutem, etc. Vobis in fide et ligeancia etc., mandamus quod—aliquem vel aliquos de quibus confidatis apud Westmon, mittabis—ad loquendum nobiscum—super dictis negotiis—et ad faciendum et consentiendem nomine vestro, super hoc quod ibidem contigerit ordinari."—*Rot. Claus*, 35 *Edward III.*, M. 36, *dorso.*

† MSS. 6517, T. p. 45.

him to the House of Lords with her own title, privileged to take his seat and vote like any other member; and if he died, and that she chose to marry again, she could send her second husband in a similar manner. A still greater privilege enjoyed by peeresses was that of sending members to the House of Commons; and that they exercised it is beyond question.*

Even in France, where the Salic law is nominally in force against women, the female noblesse not only held peerages, but exercised the judicial functions.† But in neither country have they exercised any such functions for the last century. In the British House of Commons they are not permitted to be present at the debates, except some change has taken place in their favor very recently. Nor were they thus excluded without stormy altercations; many a motion had been made against their admission before the old custom was done away with. We find a very amusing entry on the subject in "Grey's Debates," which runs as follows: "Some ladies were in the gallery, peeping over the gentlemen's shoulders. The speaker spying them called out, 'What borough do those ladies serve for?' To which Sir W. Coventry replied, 'They are for the speaker's chamber.' Sir Thomas Littleton said, 'Perhaps the speaker may mistake them for gentlemen with fine sleeves, dressed like ladies.' Says the speaker: 'I am sure I saw petticoats.'" Hatsell makes a note to this, in the second volume of the *Debates*, in which he says that he recollects one evening when the

* Several instances of this occurs towards the close of the sixteenth century; but we need only notice one. Thus, in 1572, the return of two members for the borough of Aylesburg, by Lady Parkington, is made as follows:

"To all Christian people to whom this present writing shall come: I, *Dame Dorothy Packington*, widow, late wife of Sir John Packington, knight, lord and owner of the town of Aylesburg, send greeting: Know ye, me, that said Dame Dorothy Packington to have chosen, named and appointed my truly and well-beloved Thomas Lichfield and George Burden, esquires, to be my burgesses of my said town of Aylesburg. And whatever the said Thomas and George, burgesses, shall do in the service of the queen's highness in that present parliament to be holden at Westminister, the 8th day of May next ensuing the date hereof, I, the same Dorothy Packington, do ratify and approve to be my own act, as fully and wholly as if I were or might be present there.

"In witness whereof, to these presents, I have set my seal, this 4th day of May, in the fourteenth year of the reign of our sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, queen, defender of the faith." &c.

The curious reader will find this record in Willis' *Notitia Parliamentaria*, vol. i., and in Brady's *Appendix* to his *History of Boroughs*.

† Les femmes sont capable de tenir pairies, ont opinion en jugemens, et y doivent adjournées et appellées comme les autres pairs, pour ce que elles prennent dignitéz ayans exercise de justice.—*Du Haillan*, lib. viii., f. 232.

whole gallery and the seats under the front gallery were filled with ladies ; and that Governor Johnstone, being angry that the House was cleared of all the *men* strangers, amongst whom were some friends he had introduced, insisted that all strangers should withdraw. This produced a violent ferment for a long time ; the ladies showed great reluctance to comply *with the orders of the house*, so that business was interrupted for nearly two hours. Since that time ladies of the highest rank and influence have attempted in vain to gain admittance. The three succeeding speakers—Mr. Cornwall, Lord Sidmouth, and Mr. Manners Sutton—each distinguished for his politeness and gallantry in all other circumstances, persistently refused to readmit the ladies. So strictly was the rule adhered to, that even the celebrated Madame de Staël was refused, so that in order to gain admission in company with her friend Sir John Macintosh, she had to disguise herself in male apparel.

Because the ladies had originally much more power and influence in the House of Lords than in the House of Commons, they still have some left in the former. The peeresses are yet occasionally admitted to hear the debates of their husbands and friends ; but especially at the opening, prorogation, and dissolution of parliament by the queen or her commissioners. It is only as a matter of courtesy, however, there is no law that entitles them to it. That it was different in former times is evident from a thousand circumstances. In a speech made by Lord Shaftesbury in 1675, upon the dispute between the two houses on this very question, the following curious and significant passage occurs : "I have heard of twenty foolish models and expedients to secure the justice of the nation, and yet to take this right from your lordships. I must deal freely with your lordships : these thoughts could never have arisen in men's minds, but that there has been *some kind of provocation that has given rise to it*. Pray, my lords, forgive me if on this occasion I put you in mind of committee dinners, and the scandal of it; *those droves of ladies that attended all causes : It was come to that pass* that men even *hired*, or *borrowed* of their friends, *handsome sisters or daughters* to deliver their petitions."*

If any further proof were necessary to show that what is called woman's rights, far from being a new discovery, as pretended by its advocates, is really but a remnant of bar-

*Lords' *Debates*, vol. i., p. 165.

barous times, it would be found in the conduct of female sovereigns of the present day as compared with those of past times. Thus, for example, Queen Victoria is the sovereign of one of the most powerful and most extensive empires in the world; but on what occasion has she sought to emulate men in rough masculine work, or in what requires considerable physical strength and power of endurance? She has no ambition to sit on the bench, much less to put on male apparel and take up her position in the camp or battle-field. Even when she reads the address to Parliament, prepared for her by her ministers, she does so not like a man, but like a modest woman. And who does not respect her all the more on this account? Certainly there is no real friend, or intelligent admirer of the sex who does not. Although the empress of France is not a sovereign in her own right, like Queen Victoria, she has more than once been entrusted with sovereign power by the emperor. But how modestly, and yet how judiciously, has she exercised that power! Her chief object has been, not to make a display of woman's rights, but to do what she thinks will be most agreeable to her husband. Both ladies have been implored to pardon members of their sex sentenced to death, and although weeping bitter tears for their fate have declined to interfere with the course of justice. Sometimes, indeed, each has saved a woman condemned to death, but only when there were extenuating circumstances in her case; and need we say that were they to do otherwise, however kind and generous in their intentions, they would, in time, prove themselves not the friends, but the enemies of their sex?

If we are to judge the present by the past—and there is no safer criterion—we are bound to believe that none would treat women worse, if they had the power, than those who clamor most for her "rights." The most brutal and sanguinary of the miscreants of the French Revolution pretended to regard woman as their idol; they proclaimed that one of their chief objects was to release her from the cruel bondage under which she had hitherto labored, and elevate her in the social scale. They did, indeed, release her in a good many instances, but it was from the troubles of life; they elevated her, too, but it was to the scaffold! An instance or two will illustrate our remarks on this point: Barruel, one of the most reliable of the historians of the Revolution, tells us that the Princess Lamballe was placed in the prison of La Force, where she could see the sanguinary havoc of others, and note

the preparations for her own death. At seven o'clock she was dragged by the hair of the head into the dock, where other prisoners awaited sentence. The judge of that horrible tribunal put to her a few questions, to each of which she made a firm and direct reply. They next charged her with crimes; these she firmly denied. She was nevertheless condemned, and dragged to the place of execution amid files of murderers and a load of insults. She was next ordered to kneel down by the heaps of dead bodies that were piled up beside her, and commanded to ask pardon of the nation. Her reply was: "I have not injured the nation, and will not ask pardon." On being told that her compliance might procure her release, she added, with equal firmness: "I expect no favor from the hands of ruffians who dare to call themselves the nation." Two of the miscreants seized her by the arms and threatened to tear her to pieces; on her still refusing to acknowledge them, they rushed upon her with swords, cut off her head, laid open her body, took out her heart, *bit it with their teeth* in their fury, and then exposed her naked body to the populace! Mademoiselle Servan, a beautiful young woman of eighteen, was guillotined by the same advocates of woman's rights, because she would not betray the retreat of her father. Madame Cochret, celebrated for her beauty and worth, was condemned to death for having assisted her husband to escape the guillotine; it was in vain she pleaded, what was attested by two medical men, that she was with child, and implored them to spare her for the sake of the inoffensive infant, for they severed her head from her body.

Now, the very class who acted in this manner would be the first, if out of power themselves, to set up the shout of triumph at the acquittal of a woman whom they knew to be really guilty; nay, it is the same class which has done so much to bring trial by jury into contempt in this country; for it is that which exercises no discrimination, but is always going from one extreme to another; that which will suffer any inconvenience to-day to supply a stalwart servant-maid witha seat, salut e her as a lady, with a profusion of compliments, and knock herself or her mistress on the head to-morrow, as if she were an ox, for the sake of a few dollars.

We are in no hurry to speak of the remarkable acquittals of women charged with murder which have taken place in this country during the last ten years; nor do we mean to

enter into any details on the subject, for it is not necessary. The facts are but too familiar to all; and we think it our duty rather to tell our readers what they do not know themselves, or may have forgotten, than what they are as fully aware of as we. We can truly say that none esteem the sex more highly than ourselves, and that none would do more to honor them. We have always regarded them as far less disposed to the commission of crime than the other sex; nay, we believe that it is but rarely they commit any of the darker class of crimes, except when prompted to do so by bad men whom they consider their friends. If left to the promptings of her own heart, woman is seldom otherwise than kind and generous. We think no one has described her so faithfully in this respect as Mungo Park, the great traveller: "I never addressed myself," he says, in his preface to his Travels, "in the language of kindness and friendship to a woman, whether civilized or savage, without receiving a kind and friendly answer. With man it has often been otherwise. In wandering over the barren plains of inhospitable Denmark, through honest Sweden, frozen Lapland, rude and churlish Finland, unprincipled Russia, and the wide spread regions of the wandering Tartar, if hungry, thirsty or cold, wet or sick, woman has ever been friendly to me, and uniformly so; and to add to this virtue, so worthy the appellation of benevolence, these actions have been performed in so free and so kind a manner that, if I was thirsty, I drank the sweet draught, and, if hungry, ate the coarse morsel, with a double relish."

But, if for no other reason than that she is thus a benefactress, she ought not to be encouraged to commit crime; since, in addition to whatever personal injury she may inflict on others, she not only degrades herself, but, so far as her influence goes, brings degradation on her sex. Nor is the evil entailed on society confined to the moral effect of her example; it needs no argument to prove that, if women can take the law into their own hands, and commit murder with impunity, under any pretence whatever, man will often make them the instruments of their bad passions. Accordingly, all the enlightened nations, ancient and modern, have felt the necessity of holding woman as strictly responsible for her conduct as man.

We need not remind our readers that the Jews, as well as the Greeks and Romans, punished the woman as well as the man with death, when the former deserved it, as well as the latter. Nor has Christianity, distinguished as it is above

all religions for its mildness and charity, made any exception in her case, much as it has elevated her in the social scale. Yet there have been times within the last three centuries when women have been shielded from the punishment due to their crimes the same as they have been indulged in other respects to their own detriment; but need we say that society suffered accordingly? Throughout the seventeenth century, and for a good part of the eighteenth, women seemed to think as little about poisoning their husbands, or any one, male or female, who incurred their displeasure, as they did about killing a dog that had the misfortune to displease them. Nor was the poisoning or killing mania confined to the women of any one country; it took deeper root in one country than in another only in proportion as its advocates of woman's rights were more or less numerous.

In order to illustrate our remarks on this point, we will now allude briefly to a few of the female criminals of different countries, glancing, as we pass, at the nature of their crime, and the manner in which they have been treated by the authorities. The female poisoners of the seventeenth century have formed an infamous epoch in history. The spurious gallantry to which we have been alluding in the course of this article was most prevalent in Italy during that period; and accordingly that country was disgraced by more murderesses than any other. But this fact is so universally known that we need take no further notice of it here. Were it otherwise, we might fill our whole paper with little more than a catalogue of the female criminals of Italy. As it is, we need only remark, in passing, that it required the utmost rigor of the law, combined with the important assistance rendered by the Church, to suppress the horrible mania.

Next to Italy, France had more false gallantry in the seventeenth century than any other country; and accordingly it had more female criminals in the same proportion. In proof of this we need only refer to the history of Madame de Brinvilliers, which shows that at this period the life of a man was nothing, whereas that of a woman was priceless; in other words, it was a more serious affair to trifle with the affections, or supposed affections, of a lady than it was to assassinate a man. While the latter might be done with impunity by a lady, especially if possessed of a certain amount of attractions, the penalty of the former was death. But experience taught both the authorities and the public that, after all, the best way to honor woman and raise her in the social scale was to hold her as strictly responsible for her

conduct as man, and hence it was that Madame de Brinvilliers and Madame La Voisin were both executed in 1676. Thus, the French had learned a lesson in regard to woman, more than a century before their great Revolution, which we have to learn yet. True, there were still men who thought that they could give no better proof of their regard for the sex than to try to shield them from the penalties due to their crimes. But that they were not the best men, or the best friends of the sex, is easily proved.*

We have an interesting illustration of this fact in the case of the beautiful Madame Tiquet, and it is one to which we would call the especial attention of those jurymen who imagine that, in order to be gallant, they must allow a woman to do what she likes with impunity. The gallantry of Louis XIV. has never been questioned, but he dealt with female criminals precisely as he did with the male. If he thought there were extenuating circumstances in the case of either, he spared their lives. If a man and a woman were sentenced to death, he would pardon the former before the latter if the circumstances of his case seemed to entitle him to the preference; not but he would much rather pardon the woman if the cause of justice and morality seemed to justify his doing so. So great was the influence brought to bear upon the king in favor of Madame Tiquet, in 1699, that he hesitated whether he should commute her punishment to perpetual imprisonment, as implored to do by her friends, or allow her to go to the scaffold. But one of the most benevolent of men, and one of the best friends of the sex—no other than the venerable archbishop of Paris—warned his majesty that, if he spared her, no husband would be safe. By adopting this straightforward, manly course, the archbishop served the cause of justice and morality without in any manner compromising his sacred duty as a minister of religion. He caused no one to suffer for any revelation made to his confessors or to himself; by means of the confessional he learned that many were disposed to poison their husbands, and that in most cases the fear of capital punishment was the chief restraint on their conduct. This knowledge was of the greatest importance, and it was

* Elles sont capricieuses, "says Montesquieu," indiscrètes, jalouses, légères, intrigantes; leur petites âmes ont l'art d'interesser celles des hommes. *Si tous ces vices étoient en liberté* dans un état despotique, il n'y a point de mari, point de père de famille qui peut y être tranquille; on y verroit couler de flots de sang. —*De l'Esprit des Lois*, tome i., p. 339; tome ii., p. 222.

the interest of all that the authorities should be able to avail themselves of it, especially as no one was compromised by it.*

But let us see what was the nature of the case. Madame Tiquet was no such vulgar malefactor as several of our female criminals who have been allowed to escape under one pretext or another, while it could hardly be denied that they were guilty of the murder for which they were put on trial. So remarkable were her beauty and accomplishments that, in the records of the period in which she lived, she is pronounced "a masterpiece of nature;" but we are told that her only inducement to marry M. Tiquet was the hope of making a very splendid figure in the fashionable world as his wife. Because he contrived to make her a present of a bouquet of diamonds worth fifteen thousand francs, she easily persuaded herself that he was very wealthy. Pretty soon after her marriage, however, she discovered that this was not the case, and her former indifference was changed to aversion, although his affection for her was such that he did all in his power to maintain appearances. She was scarcely three months married when she engaged in an intrigue with the Chevalier de Mongeorge. Even when this came to the knowledge of her husband, he does not seem to have annoyed her much; but one evening, when he came home somewhat later than usual, he was shot by an unseen hand at his own door. It was the opinion of the doctors that he would have been killed on the spot had not the sudden alarm caused his heart to contract so that it did not fill the usual space. Being asked by the police what enemy he could point to as most likely to have sought his life, he answered that he had no enemy but his wife. She was highly indignant that any one should dare to suspect her, and persistently refused to abscond. Her numerous "woman's rights" friends made a great outcry when she was arrested, representing her as a much injured woman. Nor was it quite clear to the authorities that there was not some truth in the charge, until a certain *laquais de place*, called Auguste Catelain, voluntarily came forward and confessed that some months previously he, Moura, the porter, and several others had been engaged by

* From various cases of this kind that have come under our notice in different parts of the world, we could never agree with those who regard the confessional as dangerous to individual or national liberty, or in any manner injurious to the cause of truth or justice. We have yet to learn that any individual or nation has unjustly suffered by it; but we have not to learn that its restraining influence on the lower classes has prevented the commission of thousands of crimes.

Madame Tiquet to murder her husband. The other parties named were promptly arrested; the fact of her guilt was established beyond all doubt, and she was condemned to die with her chief accomplice Moura.

Now be it observed that among those who did all in their power to save her life was the husband whose blood she had paid for in advance. While scarcely recovered from his wounds, he threw himself at the feet of Louis XIV and implored him to pardon her. Under such circumstances it is not strange that the king hesitated; although the same facts show that the archbishop was right in sternly advising him not to comply. Madame Tiquet still maintained her innocence. Another remarkable circumstance in her case was that the judge who pronounced the sentence of death upon her had once been her lover; but he had now a duty to perform, nor did he shrink from it. According to the custom of the time, he bade her place herself on her knees before him, in order to confess her crime, and give such information as would bring her accomplices to justice. He then proceeded to pronounce an exhortation, in which he contrasted, in the most pathetic terms, her former with her present condition. "She, who was once the idol of the world around her, blessed with beauty, youth, talents, rank, and affluence, was a criminal on her way to the scaffold!" He entreated her to spend in repentance the short time that remained to her, and by an ample confession to relieve him from the pain of seeing her placed on the rack.

But no use. It was in vain to try to move the heart that had no more tender feeling for the generous husband whose life was devoted to her than that of the bloodthirsty panther for his prey. We are told that, cold, motionless, and with unshaken voice, she answered him: "You are right. The past and the present are, indeed, strangely different; for then you were at *my* feet, now I am at *yours!* But I have done with such recollections. So far from fearing, I desire the moment that is to terminate my wretched life and release me from my misfortunes. I hope to meet my death with as much firmness as I have listened to its announcement; *and be assured that neither fear nor pain shall induce me to confess myself guilty of a crime which I have never committed.*"

This sort of language, even from the most hardened criminal, not only pleases, but convinces, the mob; it was so in this case, and accordingly the judges, the king, and the archbishop were in turn subjected to the coarsest abuse. But

no sooner is Madame Tiquet brought to the rack than her resolution fails her, and she fully confesses her guilt, also that of her accomplice Moura, but exonerates her lover Mongeorge. The two criminals were brought to the scaffold in the same car; and both died side by side, the lady acknowledging the justice of her sentence, and begging forgiveness of all she had so cruelly injured. Now, who that knows anything of human nature will pretend that it was not better for the women of France to see this woman expiate her crimes in this manner, on the scaffold, than to see her undergo a mock trial, and then escape punishment amid the plaudits of the rabble?

So late as the beginning of the present century the Germans entertained the notion that no capital punishment should be inflicted on a woman, and the ill disposed and vicious of the sex indulged their propensities accordingly, until all save the unthinking and those who sympathized with crime agreed that a new course should be pursued if human life was worth preserving. Finally the authorities resolved to make an example; and for this they had opportunities enough. In 1807 there resided in Oberland, in Prussia, a respectable middle-aged female, who supported herself by knitting; she was a widow who had evidently seen better days, but had suffered much. Her deportment was remarkably quiet and her manner engaging. The ruling principles of her life seemed to be the fear of God and the love of her neighbor. She seemed industrious withal, but still unable to secure more comfort for herself than the common necessaries of life. She was known by the name of Nannette Schönleben, but at this time her neighbors knew nothing of her history. As soon as it was understood, however, that if an opportunity of improving her condition offered she would be glad to avail herself of it, her excellent reputation procured her such a situation as she desired. In the month of March, 1808, a person of the name of Glaser, who resided at Kasendorf, engaged her in the capacity of housekeeper, at the recommendation of his own son, who had some trifling dealings with her, and formed a very favorable opinion of her character. In a short time she gained the entire confidence of her master, who regarded her as a model housekeeper; and she exercised the influence she possessed over him in such a manner that all his neighbors thought that he was perfectly right in his opinion. He was fifty years old at the time, and had been several years separated from his wife.

Some blamed him for this, and it was agreed among all that there was nothing in the conduct of the lady which justified the separation. As soon as Nannette learned these facts, she resolved to bring about a reconciliation. She wrote letters to the wife, and induced the friends on both sides to aid her in the good work. Nor did she fail to effect her object. Frau Glaser allowed herself to be persuaded, and the husband declared himself ready to receive her with open arms. In a short time the lady started for her old home, but, as she subsequently stated, with a heavy heart and strange presentiment. Writing to one of her friends, she remarked: "I cannot describe what I feel; there is a struggle within my heart that I cannot account for. Can it be a forewarning of evil?" The husband went to meet her; Nannette prepared a fête for her reception, and the whole village assembled to welcome her. Glaser seemed disposed to treat his wife with great kindness, and she was becoming quite reconciled to her husband. All her fears seemed to have passed away, when she suddenly took ill on the 26th of August, and died the same day; exactly four weeks after her return to her husband.

This was deemed an unfortunate event, but no one supposed that any one was to blame for it. As for Nannette, she was so deeply grieved that many thought she would not long survive her mistress. Soon after, however, she entered the service of a gentleman named Grohmann, who resided at Sanspariel, to whom Glaser recommended her in the strongest terms. Her new master was a fine young man, only twenty-eight years of age; but he suffered from frequent attacks of gout, and the devotion with which Nannette nursed him on these occasions, elicited his warmest gratitude. Yet he thought his wife would nurse him still better, and accordingly he resolved to have one. He made proposals to a young lady, which were accepted; all the preliminaries being arranged, a day was appointed for the marriage; but he was taken suddenly ill. Nannette never quitted his bedside during his sufferings, which were fearful; but she could not prevent him from dying, and she was inconsolable. It seemed strange that a young man who had merely an occasional attack of gout should die so suddenly; but it did not occur to any one that he was treated otherwise than tenderly by Nannette. Far from suffering in her reputation, the manner in which she had conducted herself at both those places so strongly recommended her that a lady named Gebhard, who was about to be confined, thought herself particu-

larly fortunate in obtaining her services. Nannette attended her during her confinement, and the child was happily born; but on the third day the lady was seized with violent vomitings, and after suffering much pain she died. Even this does not seem to have excited any suspicion against Nannette, for she still retained her place in the family and was regarded as a model housekeeper. Finally, however, after she had administered the fatal drug to several others, she was arrested. She, of course, pretended to be the most innocent of women; but as soon as she learned, while on her trial, that poison had been found in the stomachs of several of her victims, she confessed that she had twice administered arsenic to Frau Glaser, but only as a medicine, and without any intention of putting her to death. A strong effort to save her was made by the quasi-philanthropists on the ground that this statement was strictly consistent with her conduct through life; but the authorities were inexorable. She was found guilty of at least half a dozen of murders, and sentenced to death, with the assurance that she had no mercy to expect. Satisfied this was the truth, she occupied the interval that elapsed between her trial and execution in writing a sketch of her life. This is one of the most revolting biographies ever written. Passing over the catalogue of her acknowledged crimes as too sickening to mention, we confine ourselves to what seems to have contributed chiefly to her fall, for even she had once been a good and virtuous woman. She states that, in order to dissipate an attack of melancholy under which she labored for some months, she had recourse to novel reading. "My first book," she writes," was 'The Sorrows of Werter.' The impression it made on me was so great that for some time I could do nothing but weep. Had I had a pistol, I should certainly have shot myself. I next read 'Pamela,' and 'Emilia Gallotte.' After these I read a small pamphlet which contained the trials of five women charged with murder, all of whom were acquitted, although nothing could be clearer than their guilt." To this she adds that she was married in early life to a notary named Zwangiger. This person had neither energy, industry, nor spirit; he not only allowed her to do as she liked, but in order to raise funds urged her to do what was alike disgraceful and dishonorable to both. The habits of the notary were so irregular that few wondered when he died suddenly in 1796. Doubtless he was her first victim; but her subsequent course, as described by herself, afforded new evidence of the fact that

the woman who will deliberately assassinate her husband will not be likely to spare any stranger, male or female, who happens to incur her enmity, or by whose death she may expect to profit. One of her last remarks on her way to the scaffold was that it would have been well for herself, as well as for society, had she been detected in her first offence and tried and executed for it. "Then," she says, "several lives would have been spared; a vast amount of suffering would have been prevented; and I should not now have had so many crimes to answer for in leaving this world." We need hardly add that the fate of Nannette had a salutary effect both on the authorities and the public. For several years after, the jurisprudence of Prussia was not called upon to dispose of any similar case.

Until the "Don Quixote" of Cervantes gave false gallantry its deathblow in Spain, nothing was more common in that country than the murders of husbands by their wives. But that justly celebrated work opened the eyes of all classes to the injurious tendency of the notions then prevalent as to the manner in which a woman ought to be encouraged, even in her crimes. Ever since, women have been held responsible for their conduct quite as much as men; the former, as well as the latter, have been inexorably executed when found guilty of murder. We will note one case, as an illustration, —that of Donna Maria Mendieta of Madrid, who, towards the close of the last century, excited horror and amazement throughout Spain by the assassination of her husband. It was found on investigation that her paramour, Don Santiago San Juan, committed the deed, at her instigation, while her husband was lying sick and helpless in bed. She had made such arrangements as enabled the assassin to escape, after the commission of the crime, without being observed by the servants. That she had not committed the murder with her own hand was evident to all; but she was immediately arrested, nevertheless, and safely lodged in prison. It was supposed that Santiago was absent from Madrid at the time of the occurrence. In order that this might be urged in his favor in the event of suspicion falling upon him, he took formal leave of his mistress, in presence of several of the servants, about ten days before the murder, taking care to notify her that she need not expect him back for at least a month. But the police soon found that he had been all the time lurking about in the metropolis, from one hotel to another, under a fictitious name. However, it was found impossible to arrest

him until she herself involuntarily betrayed him by a letter she wrote from the prison, addressed to Don Thaddeo Santia, Madrid. At this period it was the custom in Spain to hang out a list of letters brought by the post, the addresses of which were not sufficiently explicit. Santiago saw the letter, and by calling for it threw himself into the coils that were spread for him. Soon after, the two were brought to trial. She was one of the most beautiful women of Madrid, and belonged to one of its most ancient families; but the judges were inflexible. Both the lady and her paramour were sentenced to death, and they were accordingly executed. Until the last moment, they solemnly protested that they were innocent; but, just as the fatal cord was adjusting about their necks, they made a full confession of their guilt, and acknowledged the justice of their sentence. Now, need we ask how much better was it for the interest of the sex to see the laws thus vindicated than it would have been to turn the trial into a farce and allow the guilty to escape?

We return again to France for the purpose of noting the case of Madame Gottfried. In 1825 a gentleman named Rumpff established himself in a house in Bremen, which belonged to, and was also inhabited by, a widow lady of the above name, who, by common consent, was a charming woman, and who was as much celebrated for her kindness and gentleness of manner as she was for her beauty. But all regarded her as unfortunate, and they sympathized with her accordingly; they thought it a great pity that such a good woman should have lost two husbands, her father, mother, brother, and several children, all in the course of a few brief years. She used to lament, herself, with tears in her eyes, that she had to perform the painful duty of ordering thirteen coffins of the undertaker; but she added that she had the consolation of knowing that she had tenderly nursed all her lost friends, never leaving their bed-side until they were beyond the reach of all earthly aid. Although now forty years of age, she had still claimants for her hand, for the worst thought entertained about her was that she had a poisonous breath, which was fatal to all who inhaled it at certain times or under certain circumstances. Partly for this reason, and partly for her "ill luck," the friends of Mr. Rumpff tried to dissuade him from establishing himself in her house. In many features of his character this gentleman was much like Dr. Burdell, the victim of a woman whose character is still more like that of Madame Gottfried. Rumpff had no faith

in the reasons assigned by his friends, and he had no idea of resigning a residence that suited him on absurd grounds. Unlike Dr. Burdell, Mr. Rumpff had a wife and family. For some time, however, the latter seemed to have great reason to congratulate himself, and his wife was, if possible, still better pleased with the change than himself, for Madame Gottfried seemed to have no other care but to render herself agreeable to both, and do all in her power for the children. Such were their relations for eight weeks, when the general joy was interrupted by the sudden death of Madame Rumpff, who was seized with a violent vomiting two or three days after her confinement. Nothing could exceed the attentions of Madame Gottfried, and so well did she play her part that the chief consolation of the dying woman in her last moments, while writhing with agony, was that she left behind her so kind a friend to protect her orphans and comfort her bereaved husband; and to all appearance her hopes and wishes were fulfilled to the letter. So friendly and affectionate was she to the children that they called her no other name than Aunt Gottfried. The infant was doing quite well, but the nurse who had charge of it soon became so extremely ill that she had to leave, declaring that whatever was the reason, she felt she should never be well as long as she remained in the house. Nor did Mr. Rumpff's apprentices fare better; they, too, were seized in turn with violent fits of vomiting, and some three months after his wife's death he became ill himself in a similar manner. Being a strong, robust man, he struggled resolutely to overcome the supposed malady; but in vain; he could keep nothing on his stomach; everything he ate caused him the most excruciating agonies, and his health declined from day to day. In about two weeks he lost the use of his fingers and toes, and became as weak as an infant. Amid all this suffering the idea of poison never occurred to him; but he thought that there might be some decaying substance about the house which exhaled a vapor fatal to the health of all who inhabited it. He made a close search for the supposed substance, causing the boards of the floor to be lifted, the walls to be opened, &c., but with no result. It is not strange that in time his mind began to fail; he now began to doubt whether, after all, there might not really be some evil spirits that pursued mankind to their destruction, wasting their bodies and withering their minds. These doubts he first expressed to Aunt Gottfried; but she told

him to trust in God, that she would watch over him like a mother; and when he described to her his sleepless nights of anguish, she earnestly wished him such sweet rest as blessed her own pillow. This state of things went on for a year, the patient growing weaker and weaker from day to day, until finally all regarded him as near his end. As was usual with him in the spring, he ordered a pig to be killed for his family, and the butcher sent him a small choice bit of the animal to taste. Finding that it agreed with his stomach, unlike anything he had recently taken, he deposited the remains of it in a closet for his next day's luncheon; but when he came to take it at the proper time, he found it was not as he had left it; and looking more closely, he was startled by perceiving some grains of white powder sprinkled over it. This attracted his attention all the more readily because he remembered to have remarked the same appearance on some salad, broth, and other articles which he had recently taken from the hands of Aunt Gottfreid. The suspicion of poison occurred to him now for the first time; he said nothing, however, but privately sent for his physician. A chemical examination soon revealed the mystery; the white powder proved to be arsenic. This discovery was made on the 5th of March, and the day following she was arrested. The police found her in bed; she protested that she was unable to leave, no matter what was their business with her, for this she pretended to have no suspicion of. It will be remembered that Mrs. Cunningham affected to be very ill also, and that it was deemed highly improper to shock her feelings in such a state. It was otherwise, however, in the case of Madame Gottfried, for she was forcibly taken out of bed and carried off to prison. The news of so unexpected a catastrophe spread dismay all over the city. First, scarcely one believed that she could be guilty; the general impression was that there must be some mistake. Who could believe, they said, that one so amiable, so friendly, and so pious—one so much esteemed and respected by all who knew her—would be guilty of poisoning her own friends? A lady, too, continued another, who could see no one in pain or misery without shedding tears. Nor was this any misrepresentation, for she wept while her victims writhed in the agonies of death, and called on God to pity them and release them from their sufferings. The fact only shows, however, that she could shed tears whenever she wished, and assume any character which she thought

as most suitable to her present circumstances. So numerous ere her crimes, and so long did it require, in consequence, collect evidence against her, that three years had elapsed om the time of her arrest until she was brought to the affold. It was clearly established on her trial that she had urdered fifteen persons, and that she had destroyed the alth of an incredible number. Until she saw that the idence against her was too conclusive to be set aside, she rsistently insisted that she was an innocent woman, whom principled enemies had conspired with each other to ruin; en, however, she confessed all, and wrote a history of her fe, the details of which are still more revolting than those ven by Nannette. The account she gives of the poisoning her own mother would show by itself that she was a oman in nothing save the form, but the worst of fiends. ad her trial been one of those farces that have disgraced the iminal jurisprudence of this country during the last ten ars, the world would never have known how one may seem nd, pious, charitable, in short, in every respect, exemplary, id still be at heart a bloodthirsty demon, capable of murder- g her own innocent children. It is only when criminals e brought to condign punishment that they reveal those cts which prove the most valuable lessons to the private tizen, as well as to the legislator, the Christian minister, id the moralist.

But one more foreign case and we are done. We select at which took place at the republican city of Hamburgh in 786, because all the circumstances connected with it showed at a people may have a high appreciation of freedom, and e sufficiently chivalric, and at the same time observe no disnction of sex or condition as affording an immunity from unishment when a capital crime has been committed. One orning in the month of February, in the year mentioned, wo laborers found a package wrapped in matting on the road etween Hamburgh and Lubeck. They lifted it and took it the nearest house, where they opened it, in the presence of itnesses, to see what it contained; and to their amazement nd horror they found the contents to consist of a human body, ithout head, arms, or hands. Those who found it took it om house to house to seek a resting-place, but no one was illing to receive so hideous a burden; having thus failed in heir efforts, they thought it best to carry the frightful packge back and leave it where they had discovered it. This ocurred on Tuesday the 24th, and on the evening of the same

day, as the mail coach was passing the spot, the attention of the postillions was attracted by the horses shying at a bundle lying in the road, which on examination proved to contain a human head and two hands wrapped in a handkerchief; a little further on they discovered, in a similar manner, the trunk which the laborers had just left there. The affair was thus brought to the notice of the authorities, and an investigation was immediately commenced. The body appeared to be that of a man fifty years of age, in good health, and the articles of dress he wore showed that his condition of life was respectable. The sack enclosing the trunk was marked with the initials P. R. W., and the shirt bore the letters J. M. H., but none could tell whom did either initials represent. The laborers remembered, however, that on the morning of the day they found the corpse, about ten o'clock, they observed a carriage drawn by four black horses, with a coachman and postillion, standing in front of the new inn at a spot called the Fleishgaffel. It started on the road to Lubeck whilst they were near, and at such a pace that when it reached the Hogenberg, where the road is steep, they lost signt of it; and it was exactly at this spot they afterwards found the body. Later in the day they observed the same carriage pass through Lutzen on its way back to Hamburgh.

When the news reached the latter city, it was suspected at once that the mutilated corpse was that of a tobacco merchant named Wächtler, who, according to the report of his wife, had left home for a long journey on Wednesday, the 22d; but the fact that no one saw him going, or knew anything of his intention to do so, created suspicion at once, especially among those who were aware that the husband and wife had frequent disagreements. All was vague, however, until a person named Hennings came forward on the 29th, and stated that he had been applied to by Frau Wächtler some days previously for one of his livery carriages to convey her as far as Lubeck, where she expected to meet her husband. She was very anxious that he would set out on Thursday evening, but he refused to travel by night, and they agreed to start at an early hour on Friday. As she mentioned that she should have rather a cumbersome package to carry, he recommended that she should allow him to fetch it and arrange it in the carriage beforehand; but she remarked that it was not necessary; that she would rather see to it herself, as it was something she was very careful about. Even in the morning he was not permitted to see it; he was invited up stairs to

take a cup of coffee, and while he was absent it was carried out and deposited in the carriage.

He did not think there was anything very remarkable in this, but when they reached the Hogenberg, the lady called out to him to stop, that she felt very ill; at the same time she expressed a wish that himself and the driver would walk a little in advance, taking the child who accompanied her with them. In a few minutes they returned and found her apparently quite recovered. Soon after, the same thing occurred, but this time she told Hennings that she felt so ill she could not proceed any further, but wished to return to Hamburgh. All this seemed natural enough to him, and he had no suspicion that there was anything wrong. It was different, however, when he heard that a body had been found exactly at the spot where the carriage had stopped. Those acquainted with Wächtler were called upon to examine the body, and their report confirmed the worst surmises. A guard was immediately placed over the house to prevent Frau Wächtler from communicating with persons from without until she was sent to prison. Many circumstances were now brought to light which tended strongly to show that she was the guilty person. A laundress named Neumann came forward and stated that, on the morning of the 22d, Frau Wächtler had sent for her and given her a bloodstained bed to wash, with strict injunctions to bring it back clean on the following Saturday. The laundress said that when she came to the house she found her "sitting on the bed as white as a corpse." It was first suspected that the servants must have been privy to the murder; but on an investigation it was found that there was no ground for any such suspicion; even her paramour, a hairdresser of the neighborhood, was entirely exonerated, although arrested as an accomplice. The substance of the evidence given by the servants of the accused is as follows: At half-past two o'clock Frau Wächtler awoke them and ordered coffee to be immediately prepared for her husband, who, she said, was about to start on a journey. The cook went below to get it ready, but she desired the waiting-maid to stay beside her. When the coffee was brought up they drank it together, the wife sitting on the side of her husband's bed, and looking very pale; the bed-clothes were drawn up, and they supposed their master was asleep. After some time, seeing that he did not stir they enquired for him, and were informed that he had just stepped to a neighboring room to see to the

packing of some wares he intended to take with him, and would be back immediately. It was after this she sent for the laundress as already stated, and then shut herself up for some hours. When the servants were readmitted to her room, she appeared to have been washing linen; the water was red, and there were some stains of blood on the floor. One of these seemed to point to an adjoining room, and the cook, whose curiosity was somewhat aroused, went there, and saw three sacks standing together, two containing soiled linen, but in the middle one she thought she felt a human head. Horror-stricken, she hastened out of the room, but could not resist the feeling that urged her to return. This time she was satisfied that she felt not only the head, but also the knees and calves of the legs. It occurred to her that it must be the body of her master; but she thought it impossible that her mistress could have contrived and executed such a deed alone.

But the worst witness against her was her own daughter, a child seven years old. She was accustomed to sleep with her father; and she related that on the night in question, just as the clock was striking two, her mother lifted her out of the father's bed, and had her placed in another, with her brothers. The suddenness of the action seems to have thoroughly awakened her; for although she was bade go to sleep again directly, she found it impossible to do so; and as she lay feigning sleep, to satisfy her mother, she observed her leave the room and presently return with a hatchet, with which she struck the father. "Father stirred a little, and there was blood on the sheet. Then mother sat down on father's bed, and drew the clothes up over him, and I went to sleep."

The trial was postponed three times because Frau Wachtler accused other persons of having committed the crime; but the only effect this had on her fate was to protract her trial, which in consequence of it lasted three years. Each of those she charged with the murder, was fully acquitted, and proved to be innocent; finally, when she saw that all her plans had failed, and that all her money would not save her, she made a full confession of her guilt two or three days before she was executed.

It is painful to reflect that in not one of these cases would the law have been vindicated had they recently occurred in this country. The worst of the criminals would have escaped under one pretext or another. The most probable result

would be that the jury would not agree; that there would be at least two or three whose "gallantry" would not permit them to condemn a woman. If, perchance, all agreed, it would probably be to acquit her on the ground that she had received some slight or insult which no lady should be expected to submit to; if the crime was proved to be too deliberate, so that it could be considered in no other light than as premeditated, then it would be found that she was insane just at the moment she committed the deed, but now quite sane and fully able to resume her former position in society.

Not only are law and justice permitted to be made a farce of in this way by our jurymen, encouraged by a vitiated public opinion, but disgrace is brought on the bench as well as the bar at the same time. It is hardly necessary to explain how this is done, for it is notorious. Who that knows anything of our jurisprudence is not aware that nine-tenths of the lawyers who undertake to defend our female malefactors act more like pugilists, or fish-women, than like advocates? Let the most exemplary person that ever lived appear as a witness against these "learned gentlemen," and he is sure to be treated as if he had devoted his whole life to thieving and lying. A stranger would think that it is he and not the prisoner at the bar who is on trial. But who would abuse even a murderer as these pettifoggers often abuse ladies and gentlemen whose only wish in the case is to state the truth when called upon by the authorities to do so? It is obvious that, even were our jurymen disposed to do their duty honestly, "without favor or affection, malice or ill will," the cause of justice would be greatly injured by this disgraceful system, since there are but few whose zeal for the vindication of the law is such that they will subject themselves to be thus used for it. Nay, many suffer serious injury themselves rather than submit to such an ordeal. The class of lawyers alluded to pursue this course whether their clients are male or female; but for the latter, they think they may throw off all restraint, and bully and abuse all who will not do as they direct them.

It is not alone in criminal cases that our jurymen and lawyers violate their trust in this shameful manner; in civil cases they pursue the same course and receive the same applause from the mob. In the latter as well as in the former, their object is not to discover what is right and just, or what is wrong and unjust, and proclaim it accordingly, but to show

that a woman is right whatever she does; that she is no criminal, although it is clearly proved that she has committed murder, and that she is a virtuous woman, although the proof that she is the reverse is equally clear.

Those who administer the law in this way would have the world believe that they are very manly; but the truth is that they are very unmanly, and that none despise them more than the sensible part of the sex whom they pretend to honor. If the jurymen who give the sort of verdicts to which we have referred would appear in their box dressed in the largest hoop petticoats, they would be much more in character than they do in their ordinary costume; and the same garments would serve the pettifoggers much more fitly than gowns. In short, it is no wonder, for the reasons mentioned, that all classes have lost confidence in trial by jury. Had it not been for this, we would have been among the first to denounce the recent trials by court-martial. Not because the military court has not done its duty conscientiously and fairly, for we think it has; but because we should not like to see such a precedent established, if we saw any reason to expect that the ordinary courts would vindicate the law and punish the guilty. But there was not the least; the proceedings in a civil court would only have added to the number of legal, or rather illegal farces with which our jurisprudence has been disgraced during the last seven years.

It is obvious that we are not peculiar in this view of the case; for then there would have been no court-martial after the war was over. Our rulers felt convinced that certain parties were guilty of murder in its worst form; but they felt almost equally certain that an ordinary jury would either disagree about their guilt, or acquit them altogether, and thus encourage others to imitate their example. None regretted more than we that a woman should be included among those doomed to the gallows; but we felt at the same time that, if a woman was found as guilty as the men, she ought to suffer the same penalty with them. None will deny that military officers who have distinguished themselves in defence of their country, have as much gallantry as the jurymen who acquit all women; as much as the pettifoggers who abuse all that give testimony against any woman; as much as the crowd of idlers or malefactors who throw up their hats in triumph when any woman is acquitted. Who would hesitate for a moment to say which of the four parties would

be the first to protect a woman if she were in danger? which would respect her most if she deserved it? or which would appreciate her charms most if she possessed such? Assuming the officers to be gentlemen properly so called, it is to them the distinction would be awarded in each case; but precisely because they possess gallantry, because they are gentlemen actuated by a sense of honor, they would remember that they have a grave duty to perform—a duty to society as well as to the government in whose service they are; they would also remember that their respect, esteem, and admiration are due not to the bloodthirsty or base of the sex, but to the virtuous and good, who would have every right to reproach them if they neglected to make that distinction.

ART. V—1. *M. T. Ciceronis Opera Omnia.* Parisiis, 1827–32.

2. *B. G. Niebuhr's Lectures on the History of Rome.* Edited by L. SCHMITZ. London, 1849.

3. *T. Mommsen: Römische Geschichte.* Berlin, 1856–9.

4. *Merivale's History of the Romans under the Empire.* Vols. 1–3. New York, 1863–4.

5. *Cicero's Letters to several of his Friends;* translated by W. MELMOTH. *Letters to Atticus;* translated by Dr. HEBERDEN. *Life,* by Dr. MIDDLETON. London, 1848.

6. *Cicero.* By THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

7. *Life and Times of Cicero.* By W. FORSYTH. London, 1864.

CHARACTER may be called the general expression of spirit. The body has its forms and features, which we unconsciously gather up into a certain unity expressing to us the entire outward man, and the features of the soul naturally blend and pass over into a harmony of their own. This generalization we seize, or attempt to seize, as it represents to us the very essence of the inner man. We name it character. It is the faithful miniature projected by the hidden soul—the brief though full utterance of the moral nature. It is, in short, the sum total of the meaning of the man. But there is more in character than in the man himself. Its roots go down into every soil he treads; its juices borrow from every stream he crosses. Each of us is, like Ulysses, a

part of all that he has met. We are the resultant of two forces —the innate tendency and the outward shaping. The wax is moulded, the loaf is leavened, the foundation is built on, the vine grows towards the light; and there comes something different. At the bottom there is temperament; and above, and through this, is circumstance. Which is the greater? Proverbs, which embody the essence of vulgar wisdom arising out of the average experience of life, are Janus-faced, looking both ways. The voice of philosophy varies according to the mouthpiece of the hour. History is the record of circumstance and men, as biography is the story of circumstance and a man. But history is made by varying interpretation, to lean now this way under the weight of law, now that way under some human impulse. To-day it admits only law, science, circumstance, abstractions; to-morrow it is the sum of biographies, and tells us of the eternal might of temperament, will, and character.

While talent, learning, and action are, in a measure, external to the man, character is wholly a part of himself. In the one case there is accretion, in the other a natural growth, showing personality and spontaneous life. Lacordaire used to maintain that the great want of our time is character. There is too much of culture and ornament, but not enough of the flavor of the individual. Instead of building up from without, we should unfold from within, aiming first of all to vivify, strengthen, and enrich character. History testifies to an aggregate character of men in the mass as well as to individual character. Each race has a way of its own, which we can all see and feel, though it is impossible always to define it. This is what Voltaire termed the genius of a nation, meaning whatever distinguishes one people from another. We fuse all that is peculiar into an average, which thenceforward stands for the spirit of the nation. It is a true though ideal conception of national character. Probably we never find our conception fully embodied in any individual; nor do we ever see in nature any object conformed throughout to its standard. Take, for example, the old Roman character. We look upon it as forming a certain national type. We have a conception, more or less vivid and complete, of a certain composite standard, which is real if taken piecemeal, but fictitious as a whole. Each of us has in his mind's eye an inventory of the chief elements in the make-up of the ideal Roman. It was pre-eminently the masculine character of the world. Built of a tough granite, it did not admit the orna-

ment and finish which we meet elsewhere. Its traits were all positive and strongly marked. It revealed no negatives and half-shading. Stoical in suffering, unscrupulous in means, selfishly aggressive in all its aims, cruel in execution, sceptical in regard to the unseen, resolute, self-centred, and unfeeling, it was a character admirably shaped for action, for pushing its way through the world, and doing the real business of life. The nation naturally took its place as the proper pioneer and road-breaker for our modern civilization. Never was there a race so thoroughly practical, so devoted to material interests, and with such a common-sense, hard-headed way of looking at things. They wrote themselves down in deeds, not words; they never originated an idea. They contributed nothing to the development of any, if we except the two ideas of law and duty. And their idea of law was rather legality and formalism than pure justice and right. Their idea of duty, it is true, rose to a majesty never before equalled; but it was the duty of the citizen, not of the individual. The man was altogether sunk in the state. So that there was very little of our modern casuistry as to questions lying between the man and his conscience: the first duty and the last was self-abnegation towards government.

Such, in the main, were the outlines of the Roman character; yet where can we see them perfectly defined? Whom can we take for the typical Roman? Not Cæsar; for he was a universal man, who would overfill any standard made up of averages. Not Pompey surely; for his constant study of effect, his tricks of acting, and his vainglorious self-consciousness were wholly alien to the simplicity and directness of the national character. Set off with the pomp and circumstance of the Orient, he was in spirit and habit far more Asiatic than European. The great Scipio—one of the most peculiar names in history—has come down to us invested with a kind of personal fascination and rare kingliness of character, and an air of large serenity and repose, quite un-Roman. He was more and other than pure Roman. Most persons would be inclined to single out the elder or the younger Brutus, or one of the Catos, as completely embodying all the national traits and ideas. But the claims of either Brutus lose much of their force by reason of an unpleasant flavor of charlatanism and of the *ad captandum* which continues to linger about them, and which in the case of the younger Brutus amounts almost to positive taint,

when taken in connection with his well-known usurious and peculating propensities. The Catos best represent the great central ideas of justice and duty, but they hardly conform to the standard on all sides. The fussiness and old-womanishness of the Censor detract much from the symmetry of his character. And we do not quite like to see an ideal man loaning his wife, or prescribing the suitable diet for a wide circle of friends, or in the guise of an amateur quack, dosing all his kith and kin through their ill turns. The Uticensian, in the midst of a nation remarkable for practical tact and knowledge of men, was noted as a perfectly impracticable and unelastic member of the community. Cicero wrote to Atticus that Cato did much mischief by laying down his dicta as if he were living in the republic of Plato, not in the dregs of Romulus. And Merivale has well described him as "a pedantic politician and a scholastic formalist," one whose character "was a system of elaborate though perhaps unconscious affectations." He was, in fact, a dilution of his great-grandfather, seasoned with some very unpalatable hobbies. Sulla was more a Sybaritic Greek than a Roman. Perhaps Marius represented most completely the entire cycle of the national character regarded in its lowest grade. There was in the man an innate scurviness and dog-in-the-manger spirit anything but heroic, or true to the temper of the people in its higher forms. A knot of such fellows might have fused into a party of roughs, but could never have grown into a nation.

What, then, shall we say of Cicero? Can we take him for the true representative Roman? By no means, for, properly speaking, he was hardly Roman at all. He had less of the havor of the soil than any of the national chiefs. Cicero was the Frenchman of antiquity. His whole nature seems to us thoroughly French. He looms before us as the primeval cultured Celt. No other historical Roman, and no Greek, with the possible exception of Alcibiades, had so many purely Celtic traits: at whatever point we meet him, we are constantly and irresistibly reminded of the characteristics of that ancient tribe as described in the old classic writers. In reading his orations, his philosophy, and above all his letters; in dissecting the make-up and temper of the man, his logic saturated with rhetoric, his ready wit, his quick perception, his fickleness, his gusts of passion, his sudden laughter and tears, his verbosity, his lack of endurance, dignity, and consistency, his frivolity and vanity—almost every-

where, in short, we meet with a peculiar flavor, a certain seasoning, which we of Saxon lineage regard as characteristic of all our Celtic cousins.

This quasi-Celtic ingredient is the leaven which leavens the whole loaf. It is an element to which we owe much, for it has contributed largely to give us our thorough knowledge of Cicero. It led him to come out of himself, to deploy all his strength and weakness in the face of the world, and place himself in some sort of personal relation to every one. He had no reticence, no *mauvaise honte*, no delicacy about making revelations of self. His personality crops out everywhere, for it was his delight to thrust himself before mankind in all sorts of postures and guises. It was a supreme gratification to him to tear down every barrier of reserve between him and his intimates, and then gush forth in the most confiding abandonment of conversational or epistolary intercourse, deluging with the secrets of his soul the friend whom he had happened to buttonhole. He had the French passion for living out of doors, for washing his linen in public, and for making himself the hero and his friends the victims of a memoir, which, however, was never in his case moulded into a systematic treatise, but made up of fragments scattered hap-hazard on all sides. Yet these piecemeal revelations were nowise inferior to any former dissertation on self made by the best of them: they outlined and filled up the man completely. And so much of all this still remains that we know Cicero to-day almost as his nearest friends did—*intus et in cute*. We know him quite as well as we do the Cardinal de Retz, the Duke de St. Simon, and the many other worthies who flourished in the memoir-making days of the old regime. He was, indeed, his own Boswell—a most communicative autobiographer, sending forth always, without let or hindrance, whatever chanced to lie uppermost at the moment.

It has been remarked that no one of the ancients could so well stand the severe test which Cicero has afforded of himself, in his Letters, though they convict him of vanity, inconstancy, sordidness, jealousy, malice, selfishness, and timidity. This is undoubtedly true; for, in the matter of practical morality, in freedom from gross vice, and pureness of living, Cicero was far in advance of his contemporaries. His character was more than ordinarily good, yet he was a man of no character. This seeming paradox arises from the sophism always lurking in the word character. In so far as

the moral element enters into the use of the term—in so far as it denotes a collection of qualities based on certain principles of action proceeding from some higher or lower standard of abstract morality—Cicero was a man of better character than the average of his time. He professed higher motives of action, though his profession did not invariably bear fruit in practice. Perhaps he conformed less to his higher standard than others did to their lower. He practised less vice if he did not uniformly display more virtue than his fellows. He kept more within the letter of the law, if not within its spirit: he committed fewer great breaches of the technical rules of morality, religion, and law, than any prominent man of his time. But he did much towards making up in quantity what was lacking in quality. His deviations in a petty way were very numerous, exhibiting wonderful resources in the art of concocting new varieties of the lighter shades of culpability. Of indiscretions, errors, peccadilloes, faults, and the like, the harvest was large; and intertwined with these there came to light no slender growth of sins against the truth. These were of all hues, from whitest to blackest, including white lies, romancing, mental reservation, prevarication, perversion, downright fibbing, duplicity, and hypocrisy. So that his lapses were plenty enough, taking all together. He was very little of a saint, indeed: the times were bad, and he was a trifle better, to say the least. In the morality of private life he was esteemed particularly pure.

Still, as we have said before, Cicero was a man of no character. The term character may imply will as well as morals, and mark degrees of force no less than of goodness. It may be taken to mean the aggregation of distinctive, strongly pronounced qualities of any kind manifesting strength and self-sufferingness in an unusual degree. And in this view its only criterion is the innate vigor, the creative energy, which comes of a happy combination of robust spiritual traits. But just here Cicero's nature was deficient and altogether weak. It was wanting in self-derived, positive traits. There was no firmness nor homogeneousness of texture about the man. He had no tone, no strong original bias, no inflexible determination to this side or that. As he was wholly wanting in self-centred reliance, he neither ruled himself, nor knew the secret to command others. He had nothing of the instinct of leadership, and could not have had under any circumstances. In populous city or desert island, it must have been all one with him; for he was of wax, not iron—the

mould, to take shape, not the pattern to give it. He always found it difficult to take a side steadily, and in casting about for a choice he seldom decided of himself, or from the merits of the case, or according to high principles involved. To make up his mind, he leaned on friends and incidentals. He had, from first to last, by nature and conviction, all the instincts of a trimmer. Without touching upon other instances, three cardinal cases may be mentioned from different periods of his life.

In youth, he for some time held the balance uncertain between the Sullan and Marian factions, until at last the scale, overweighted merely by the claims of kinship and the hope of rising in the state, dipped down to Marius and his rabble. Still he went on whiffling between the traditions of the rival chiefs; so that even the tolerant and admiring Niebuhr confesses, in reference to this matter, that there was throughout life a kind of discord in his character. Again, in his prime, during his consulship, the very culmination of his life, he shuffled most scurvily between nobles and people, in his attitude towards the agrarian law proposed by Servilius Rullus. He had not the nerve to break at once with either party, so he tried the mad expedient of riding two horses at once, in order to please both sides. He was neither *pro* nor *con.*, but on the fence, glibly rattling off all the while, both ways, the twofold Shibboleth. Here it was all Gracchus, agrarianism, the great Marius, and the sacred tribunate; there, it was the privileges of caste, the glorious Sulla, legal quibbles and the not-give-an-inch policy. And all this was the utterance of one and the same man, speaking to-day in the forum to the populace, and to-morrow in the senate-chamber to the Conscript Fathers. It was not simply the indecision or evasion of a halting nature, but the downright duplicity of an unscrupulous trimmer. In time the folly of his simulation became apparent even to himself, and the lover of the commons then leaped over into the arms of the nobles. Partisan Middleton himself could not fail to see with half an eye that the case did not look well for his favorite, and therefore, assuming that Cicero was always an aristocrat at heart, defended the coquetry of the youthful politician with the multitude as a necessary and justifiable condition precedent in order to get office. Of course, after he had successfully climbed to power, it was proper to kick down his ladder, and take another foothold.

Still later in life, during the gathering blackness, and in

the very thunderings of the tempest-tossed commonwealth, the man of words hung irresolute. Aghast at the awful portents, he did not act, but nervelessly awaited the fury of the elements. Fearful of neutrality, and equally fearful of committing himself positively and unreservedly to either party, he at last weakly declared for Pompey and his cause. He showed no fervor of devotion in his advocacy, for that might break the charm, and close the one loophole of escape which a judicious lukewarmness would keep open as an avenue to reconciliation in case of possible mishap. Neither measures, nor men, nor consistency, nor honor, nor reputation, availed so much as the desire for personal safety in any event, come what might. This fluctuating temper and half-hearted partisanship have, however, often been praised as the highest virtue, under the circumstances—the only course remaining in the premises to a true lover of his country. He saw, it is said, that the times were out of joint, but knew no way to better them; he had no hearty faith in either of the contending leaders. One great fact stared him in the face—his bleeding country—and he wept; which was all that could be done. His indecision was simply a prudent moderation, and his post of trimmer was nothing less than the high and honorable office of mediator between angry factions.

In answer to such misplaced eulogy many things might be said. For our present purpose, however, it will be sufficient to touch merely upon a few points. Nor will it be necessary here to pronounce any judgment upon the questions at issue between Cæsar and Pompey; for, whatever our own view may be, the conduct of Cicero can be fairly surveyed only from his own stand-point. His meed of praise must be apportioned according to the sincerity of his convictions, and the consistency of his practice with his avowed principles. That he mourned deeply and sincerely the feuds of his unhappy country there is no reason to doubt. To Papirius Pætus he wrote that he had bewailed the miseries of his native land longer and more bitterly than ever tender mother bewailed the loss of her only son. In a letter to Nigidius Figulus, he remarked that the calamities of his country had spoiled him for the jocose epistles of happier days, and made him unable to write, or even to think, cheerfully; in fact, he thought himself guilty of a crime in still continuing to live. And so his letters of this period to nearly all of his friends breathe similarly of deep-seated sorrow. This lamentation was creditable to his sensibility, but some

roader foundation was necessary in order to raise a super-
tructure of exalted patriotism. A large majority of the nation
ıust likewise have sincerely mourned over these troublous
imes, and preferred the piping times of peace; for in the
empest there was danger lest all should go down. But in
atriot statesmen tears should ripen into earnest deeds, or
hey are of little worth. If there was really no door left
pen to a sincere man for action, the only consistent course
emaining was complete inaction; either one thing or the
ther. But Cicero took neither course, and therefore shut
imself out alike from the possible benefits of the first and
rom the personal dignity of the last. His plan was one of
alf-action, of shilly-shallying. He believed in some sort of
ogic of events, and was averse to taking too firm a stand any-
vhere. His policy was really a no-policy. In his own eyes
t doubtless seemed a masterly inactivity, laudable for its wise
noderation and hopes of mediation. It was, in fact, only the
veakness of a negative nature, always uncertain whether the
ıetter course, on the whole, was to work or to wait. So the
wo heterogeneous elements of doing and not doing were
nixed to the neutralization of one another.

To one who would fain believe in the sincerity of Cicero's
ıttachment to Pompey, it is fatal to read the conflicting tes-
imony of his own declarations. To one set of friends he writes
ırofessing the greatest esteem, affection, and gratitude for
his greatest man of any age, whom he calls his beloved,
ınd to whom he confesses himself indebted for everything he
ıossesses. Meanwhile he is asserting to another set of cor-
espondents that Pompey is a do-nothing, who has ruined
ıimself and lost every supporter; that he has nothing noble,
ıothing exalted, nothing that is not abject and plebeian; that
ıe is all mystery and artifice; that he has sunk irretrievably.
The writer shows the fertility of his invention by concocting
ıxtraordinary nicknames in order to lash his pseudo-friend in
he dark. It puts him in high spirits to be able to write to
ı friend concerning the abyss into which this great Sampsi-
ıeramus, as he often calls his lost leader, has fallen; and his
ealous vanity is gratefully soothed, as he confesses, by the
hought that his own reputation with posterity will now be
n no danger of an eclipse from the prominence of a too illus-
rious rival.

Nor is it easy to draw the distinction sometimes urged,
and to say that Cicero was devoted to the cause, though not
to the leader. He was half-hearted towards both, showing no

more steadiness to measures and principles than to the man who represented them. His partisanship or patriotism, whatever it is called, was like his friendship, laggard and freakish. After the gage of battle had been flung down, and while Cæsar was pounding the Pompeian lieutenants in Spain, Cicero had not yet quite made up his mind where to stand and what to do. Indeed, so little had he gone over to the enemy, that Antony, acting in behalf of Cæsar, thought it not out of place to send to the wavering orator a letter of advice touching his conduct. Long after this, Cæsar kept approaching him with favorable offers of place and patronage, in a way which so shrewd a judge of men would never have attempted if it had been apparent that the door of agreement had been finally closed and bolted so as to cut off every avenue leading to the citadel. They were not such offers as spring from personal friendship alone, nor such as could be made either to a thorough Cæsarian or to a full-fledged Pompeian. With the one they would have been unnecessary, and with the other useless. They were thrown out as random shots to sway a purposeless man. On his way home from Cilicia, while the air was rife with portents of evil, Cicero dropped an informal note to his wife and daughter, informing them that he expected a civil war to break out, and supposed it might become necessary to declare for one side or the other. His want of faith in Pompey's policy, civil and military, appears in the remark in a confidential letter to Athens, that he had long ago found Pompey to be the most unstatesmanlike of men, and now knew him to be the most unmilitary. A subsequent letter to Atticus records the conviction that Pompey's policy for the past ten years had been full of mistakes. So little was the aimless orator inspired by true love of country, that he still clung feebly to the skirts of Pompey and his party, although he well knew their avowed design, in case of success, to wreak the direst and completest vengeance, by fire and rapine and barbarian sword, not only on Rome, but throughout Italy. His son-in-law, Dolabella, who knew him well, conceiving his motives of action to be simply his personal relations to Pompey, urged him strongly to declare for Cæsar, the favorite of fortune, saying that everything had been done which could be claimed from friendship and gratitude. So lightly did his political principles, views, or sentiments, however they may be named, sit upon him, and so strong were his convictions of the worth of expediency, that he agreed with Cassius to be governed by the result of a

single battle. Cassius, therefore, in accordance with the spirit if not the letter of their pact, hastened upon the first reverse to hand over his fleet to Cæsar, victor. His comrade still adhered to Pompey, yet so negatively, that he was felt to be a hindrance to the cause. He disgusted all his associates by his constant levity and sneering when in camp before the enemy; and it was felt that a heavy burden was removed when he went away to Dyrrachium, where he awaited the final wager of battle. And after Pharsalia, still dubious and half-regretful concerning his course, he thought it well to write to Marcus Marius in defence of his policy, claiming to have sacrificed safety to honor in joining Pompey. Yet safety was so far consulted that, as he says, many friends condemned him for not laying down his life in the cause; and he seems to have been still uncertain here as elsewhere, whether on the whole he had done right. To Cæsar he soon became reconciled, and, though not professing the same political creed, was far from making himself objectionable. Always overawed by the personal majesty of the great Dictator, and magnetized by his presence, he maintained a judicious reserve until the Ides of March were over, and then he boldly trampled on the dead lion, and heaped execrations on his memory. We can hardly believe that these rancorous attacks were dictated by an eye only to the common weal; the time, the circumstances, his previous conduct, and his own revelations of himself, all forbid such a thought. So long as the famous letter to Lentulus Spinther exists, with its special pleading, its tortuous apologies, its acknowledgment of inferior motives, and its confession of a preference of persons to principles, and of an individual bias in political action, so long will it be natural for men to think that the flickering patriotism of the declining republic took shape from a hesitating temper, unsettled principles, wavering passions, and private griefs, as well as from an honest regard for the general good.

We have dwelt at some length on this portion of Cicero's career not simply because it was the most critical epoch of his life, but because it best illustrates the ups and downs of his conduct, and furnishes perhaps the best key to unlock the waywardness of his character. His deficiencies and inconsistencies arose from the want of some one high dominant principle to direct and regulate thought and action throughout all their phases. His various faculties were never co-ordinated into any true harmony of expression, but seemed

tumbled in together without subordination or symmetry. The noble and the mean often rubbed clothes, touched hands, and warmly embraced. There were fitful flashes of beauty and strength, but no even flame of order. He needed a strong and constant motive-power to give steadiness of movement—a power arising from the controlling action of some superior faculty, passion, or sentiment, asserting and maintaining for itself the central place, and ruling his entire nature with paramount and uniform sway. Seneca said: "Nemo sine vitio est; in Catone moderatio, in Cicerone *constantia* desideratur."

This want of a firm and steady central principle in Cicero's character may be best brought into relief by comparing him in this one point with Cæsar and Pompey, the greatest of his compeers. A cardinal difference between them and him strikes us at once: they were both positive men, with a purpose, while he was a negative man, without one. They had each a motive-power within, giving vigor and uniformity of action. But the want of this was Cicero's notable deficiency.

Let us look first at Pompey. The central principle of the man was a deep-seated, over-mastering pride, inborn, inbred, and all-pervading. He was a devout believer in himself, a very ultra-Pompeian. He seemed to himself born to be king of men. Homage and place, in his view, naturally gravitated to him because he was their true centre, and it could not be otherwise. They fell to him not by chance as a favor, but from necessity as a due. All his sentiments, opinions, and actions were moulded by his supreme self-sufficingness; everything grew out of this root. From this as a stand-point he surveyed the world of men and things; through this his life gained a consistency which otherwise it might have lacked. To this was due, in great part, his early advancement, for it was difficult to withhold any prize from a majestic boy whose faith in himself was so firm. He looked and acted like one predestined to rule; and so men hastened to ratify destiny. Hence, too, mainly came his fall. His overweening self-confidence led him to lean upon himself alone, disdaining to take the precautions and employ the means which were essential to success, and of which any less royal person would have gladly availed himself. At this time, moreover, men had begun to doubt their splendid idol, who, so serene and self-centred, had made such abundant drafts on their reverence. He had carried matters with so high a hand, and

had so often failed to make performance and promise run parallel, that now, in his decline, others failed to accord to him that confidence which he still retained in himself. They had come to doubt, and doubt was to him ruin. In the old days, it was enough for him to wait majestically while others would labor for him; now they had become lukewarm in their labor as in their reverence. But in his prime it must have been no easy thing to withstand his lofty mein, his sublime arrogance, and his calm assurance in his own sufficiency for the needs of the nation. One who bore himself so loftily in his own spirit could not fail, the people thought, to attain an equal height in action. His supreme majesty quelled all cavillers. Who could doubt the greatness of a being who never doubted himself, but was everywhere all in all to himself, like a god? His presence, dignity, and magnificence drew to him worship, but never a hearty confidence. He was distrusted while he was admired. He conciliated none, yet bore down almost all by the sheer force of an inflexible pride counterfeiting the seal of kingship. But his lordly way could not avail long with the nobles, for they preferred for leader one who was more devoted to the cause, and was less self-conscious and artificial—the simpler, straight-forward Cato. Cicero, though an adherent of Pompey, always looked askance at his leader, and could never forget the many snubbings he had received. There always rankled in his mind the cool indifference of Pompey, dictator, towards the merits of Cicero, saviour of the republic. He took it ill that Pompey showed him no affection, and wrote him no letters of congratulation for services which the universe applauded. He expostulated in a petulant letter for such treatment, yet at the same time expressed the hope that Pompey would some time come to appreciate his claims, and admit him to friendship on equal terms. Such terms, however, could never be granted to Cicero or any one else. Neither Pompey nor Cæsar could tolerate a rival near the throne—the former from pride, and the latter from love of power. While with inferiors Pompey could be affable enough, he exhibited to those claiming equality only opposition or insolence. He cared nothing for the common badges of place and power, craving, as Plutarch says, only unusual honors which would set him apart from all others. In this he was not influenced by a love of power; for when the greatest power ever granted to a Roman citizen was offered to him—the supreme dictatorship, to crush Mithridates—he sighed at the burden,

and longed for the freedom of private life. Whenever he sought power, it was not as power, but as place—as a guarantee of his ascendancy over others—the outward seal to the greatness of which he had always full assurance to himself. He had no desire to take upon himself the trouble of ruling over such a beggarly set of fellows as mankind in general. As he was indifferent to the public, the public thought him a demigod, and discovered late, or never, how much earthly dross had been fused with the divine gold. His faith in himself was strong enough even to hoodwink fortune, who gave him the laurels woven for other brows, and suffered him to reap the rich harvests sown by Crassus, and Catulus, and Metellus, and Lucullus. He saw no reason why he should not reign over the past as well as the present; and it was in this spirit that he used to quote Sulla, and say, "Sulla potuit: ego non potero?" In short, from whatever point of view we survey his character, we find it centre always in an imperial pride, which dazzled and magnetized the world by mocking it, and secured the prizes of life by believing them to be due, and waiting for them to come to their master. It was this which inspired an oriental majesty of demeanor and a calm self-worship almost irresistible. It organized and reduced to method all his faculties, and gave to the whole man a consistency and roundness of character seldom known, a consistency which would be lacking in a view taken from any other centre.

A far different style of man was the great Marian leader—the world-subduing Cæsar. His character was, like Pompey's, rounded into the completeness of a symmetrical, self-supporting arch; but, unlike Pompey's, its keystone was not pride, but love of power. He sought for distinction not in itself, nor as ministering to pride, but simply as the visible assurance of power, the sign and seal-manual of authority over others. He cared little for the distant homage and semblance of awful worship with which his rival delighted to inspire mankind; nor did he value at a pin's fee the gauds and trappings of place which tickled the feebler soul of the show-loving orator. His pride did not ask the post of demigod, nor was his vanity eager for the *digito monstrari*. It was substance, not shadow, which alone could satisfy the tremendous needs of that aspiring soul. And so that he got the substance, it was of little moment how he got it or in what guise it came—whether in naked majesty, or wreathed with flowers, or set out with tinsel ornament. He aimed

first, last, and only, to become foremost man of the world. To this one object all other things were means and incidents, or else mere makeshifts and matter of indifference. Throughout all his seemingly devious way, he was striking straight, by an infallible intuition, and by the very necessity of his nature, for leadership in one way or another. No one form of power could suffice: his very being seemed to demand supremacy over his fellows in nearly every mode of human thought and action. No other such manifold man has ever walked the earth. He was all powerful: the question of his superiority was simply the question of what he might choose to turn his hand to. He not only burned for general dominion over all, but was resolute to surpass each man in his own specialty. It was not enough to beat with their own weapons generals, philosophers, orators, statesmen, historians, grammarians, bookworms, critics, and men of letters; he must enter the lists with the men of the world, the *arbitri elegantiarum* and outdo the common soldier in the endurance of physical hardships, and in valor against the enemy. Nothing of all this arose from mere love of display. It was his nature to crave dominion of every sort; to seek to surpass others in little things as well as in great ones. He would not otherwise have been self-consistent; he would not have been the Cæsar of whom history has told us. But while these minor ambitions struggled each into a foremost place, they were always subsidiary to his grander purpose to rule the world. They were wheels within wheels, forwarding directly or indirectly the great central movement, and never jarring.

Cæsar could be facile, elastic, and versatile beyond all other men in what he deemed, comparatively speaking, the trifles of life. But the mainspring of his existence—the will to rule—was stiff as steel, and never swerved a hair. He stickled at nothing which could further his ever-present aim: expediency towards that end was a virtue—the god whom he worshipped, and to whom he constantly sacrificed. His cardinal motto was, "When you are in Rome, do as the Romans do;" for thus, it seemed to him, by the straight-forward logic of intuition, he might best master the Romans. The perfect simplicity of his character has been remarked as giving to him in an unusual degree the tact to discern, and so to avail himself of the signs of the times. It was the simplicity which springs from a sovereign purpose, and gives both homogeneousness within and singleness of vision without. He knew thoroughly man, men, the times, and the world, and used

them as he listed. He mingled so easily with the citizens, and was so much at home in all the ways of their world, that few were able at first to see, under his jaunty dandyism and careless profligacy in youth, anything but gambling, dissoluteness, debt, and unprecedented largess for the popular spectacles. In all this he was merely handling the necessary tools, familiarizing himself in all the ways and means, schooling himself in the temper of the people, and making himself at one with them. Sulla, however, early looked below his easy exterior, and descerned many Mariuses even in the boy. Cicero, who had begun to fear that a dangerous plotter against government lay concealed behind the gracious demeanor of the extravagant young man of fashion, was disarmed of his suspicions when he perceived how carefully Cæsar arranged his hair, and adjusted it with one finger. Such a man, it seemed to him, could never overthrow the government, or even think of doing so. Yet undoubtedly at that time, as well as later, it was the continual aim of Cæsar to make himself, in some shape or other, the very pivot of affairs—the focus of the commonwealth. But the time had not come then; and he was only learning. As he himself said, it would always have been his preference to be first man in an Alpine hamlet, rather than second man in Rome. Lucan said that Cæsar could bear no superior, nor Pompey an equal. A further difference might be added: superior power was what Cæsar's ambition could not brook, but it was the thought of equal dignities which shocked Pompey's pride. The same distinction would hold in regard to Plutarch's saying, that while the gods had been contented to divide heaven, hell, and sea among three, the whole Roman empire was not large enough to contain these two. A compeer anywhere would have been equally offensive to both, though from different motives.

In the matter of morals, Cæsar was neither better nor worse than his age, but a good expression of its average. He was as good as he cared to be, or as he thought it would be worth while to be in the given circumstances. His mind being absorbed in other things, he troubled himself little about any theory or over-scrupulous practice of ethics, being content in this regard to go with the current. He believed that there cannot be two first principles; and nature had from the beginning decided in his case which should be first, and culture had only confirmed nature's fiat. A perfect circle must have but a single centre; and from a centre of power, not morals, his character always radiated. Hence, from the dire

necessity of consistency with himself and his aims, his humanity and many of the finer traits natural to him were deflected from their course. To show Cæsar's natural kindness, Cicero recounts, in a letter to Atticus, the favors received by himself and his brother Quintus, and then exclaims: "Ye gods! should you not love this man?" But nowhere can we find so symmetrical an edifice erected on the corner-stone of power. Nowhere can we find faculties so grand co-operating uniformly towards what might be called at once their chosen aim and their final cause. The strong will, the self-reliant, searching, far-reaching intellect, the unbending devotion to a purpose,—these permeated a strongly pronounced individuality, and, disciplined to harmony, and inspired to strange energy by a lofty ambition, combined to give to Cæsar an original personality—a character of his own, which, either in volume or in degree, we could not confound with any other. His, too, was pre-eminently a seminal mind, whereas Pompey, from the utter barrenness of his nature, never did, and never could in any circumstances, have originated anything. Cicero's mind was of the transmissive order —a conduit from large reservoirs down to the channels of daily use. It was a grafted stock, bearing fruit not quite its own, but nourished with its own juices.

Cicero, unlike Pompey and Cæsar, can hardly be said to have had, as we remarked above, any character at all. There was nothing about him that was original, distinctive, peculiar to himself, stamped with the impress of his own soul. He had neither the vigor nor the steadiness which comes only from the influence of some one supreme central faculty. The centre of the man, so far as he can be said to have had a centre, lay in his vanity. That was his pivotal point. It was the nucleus round which his very existence gathered, the fountain of his actions, the key-note of his views of life, and the root of his philosophy. Nothing pleased him so much, and nothing did he yearn for so eagerly, as to make a good appearance beforeothers. As his desire to please was a maximum, and his fear to offend a minimum quantity, he was spurred on to unremitting labors, in order to secure the coveted applause, while he was for the most part left free from any torturing doubt of a triumphant success. Having in himself no real self-reliance, and distrusting the sufficiency to itself of any verdict of his own soul, he was necessarily led to surrender himself to the judgment of the world, or of the limited circle which was the world to him. For similar reasons, he

was always disinclined to commit himself to opinions which were original or distasteful, or even not quite certain of acceptance by his coterie; for there would be risks about novelties, and his chance of approbation would be far greater to take up opinions which were in vogue, and hammer them out in graceful style for popular use. So in all his philosophy he never thought, or even aimed to think, a real thought of his own. In speculation and in action, his constant enquiry was: What will they say? Which course will secure to me the loudest plaudits? How can I make the best appearance before my friends, and keep myself most acceptable in the long run to the people? In every given case, the first thought of all was of himself, how he would look, and what would be said of him; and then, and not till then, came other considerations. While Pompey looked upon the world as a little spot far beneath his own greatness, and Cæsar regarded it as a kingdom worth ruling, Cicero saw in it a theatre admirably adapted for display. To Pompey, mankind were inferiors; to Cæsar, citizen-subjects; and to Cicero, audience and spectators. He drew his breath, and had his very existence in the voice of those about him. His hunger for fame gives to us the impression of a constant desire on his part to produce a certain lasting stage-effect on others, rather than to do deeds which should of necessity bring glory. To satisfy any moral or intellectual needs of his own was to him of far less moment than to present an appearance. "What will they say about us six hundred years hence?" was a question often raised, quite as much in earnest as in sport, when any new course must be taken. On returning to Rome after his exile, his first thought was regarding his wings, which, he said, had been clipped by his opponents; and which, he trembled to think, might possibly never grow again. He boasted with great unction of the attention shown to him, and of the fact which his nomenclator assured him, that not one prominent citizen was absent when he made his entrance into the city. The welcome he met with would, of course, justify some elation; his mistake, however, was in looking at it merely as a personal matter, and in making it the ground for undue displays of egregious vanity. This was a mistake of which he was often guilty; looking, as he did, from the wrong stand-point, and through a false medium, he inevitably saw things distorted, and in unnatural relations.

As Cicero was steady in nothing, and was not wholly one thing or another, so he was not uniform in his vanity, or in

his thoughts about his vanity. The climax was reached in his celebrated line, "O fortunatam, natam me consule Roman;" while its lowest dip appears in his weary, half-serious, half-jocose saying, as he counted the waves on the beach at Antium, disgusted at the very thought of writing: "I would rather have been a duumvir here than have been consul at Rome." The key-note to his more common sentiment is found in a letter from his province of Cilicia to Atticus: "In the meantime, it is something splendid that Ariobarzanes should live and reign by my assistance." What usually pleased him most, was to have some show of power, accompanied by a liberal outlay of admiration on the part of the bystanders. He even persuaded himself that he had never spoken of himself in any of his speeches, unless attacked, which simply proves that his memory on that point was not good. In a letter to Atticus, which nobody else was to read, he had no need, he said, to fear the reproach of vaingloriousness in speaking of himself; and accordingly he availed himself of the opportunity to speak of himself as actually inspired in a certain oration recently delivered to the senate on the state of the nation. He writes that once, on entering the theatre, he was received with great applause, and adds, having apparently at the time some unusual scruples of modesty, that it was silly in him to mention it. What chiefly embittered his exile was the fear lest, after all, he should fail to receive the meed of applause and admiration which he felt to be his due, and for which he hungered. This horrible fear of being cheated with both contemporaries and posterity gave rise to an almost unparalleled series of self-torturings, unmanly whimperings and howlings, and degrading revelations of self. He wrote truly of himself to Atticus: "I want not merely my goods and my friends, but myself; for what am I?" His whole nature was almost unhinged, and reason tottered on her throne. The thought of suicide constantly presented itself as the only resource left to mortified vanity, and was again and again broached in his familiar correspondence. His friends thought him insane. And not till his welcome back to Rome had given to him full proof that his name was on the lips of the people, and that his services were properly recognized by others, and loudly praised by all the world, not till then was Cicero really himself. Such an utter overthrow, such bounds and rebounds, could have been experienced only by the most negative nature. A character positive on any side, one built up solidly from any

foundation-principle, and resting on any corner-stone whatever, one having any real centre of its own, inspired by any high master-passion, and buttressed by sentiments or opinions which not only sustained but had become a part of itself, could never, from any cause, so long as it existed and retained its identity, have been guilty of such abnegation, of so humiliating a surrender of itself. But Cicero had nothing in himself to which he could appeal; he saw only the image of himself as reflected in the mirror of the world. Pompey, on the other hand, saw only himself in himself; and Cæsar saw the world in and through his own soul. To Cicero the calm assurance of having done his duty was of little worth; nor could he derive much satisfaction from a belief in the favorable verdict of future times, and a triumphant vindication of himself and his measures, so long as the salvos of his contemporaries were withheld. "Be a senate to yourself," he once wrote to his friend Plancus; advice which no man ever needed more, or followed less, than himself. The oracle at Delphi read the character of the youth correctly when it urged him not to be led by the opinions of others, but to trust to himself. And Livy, referring to the want of manliness and, so to speak, the flabbiness of character which marked him, said that he bore none of his calamities as a man should, except his death. Even at that time he kept hesitating and paltering between conflicting emotions, uncertain what he had best to do, until circumstances forced a decision, and left him no escape, and then he confronted his assassins courageously. In fact, he never took a position, or started a movement until inaction and neutrality were out of the question. It was not in his nature to take time by the forelock and meet coming events half-way. He looked to see which way the wind lay, trimmed his sails, and waited for some mighty blast to drive him out on the great deep. It was thus even in his conduct towards the Catilinarian conspiracy, and in the fulmination of the Philippics against Antony, events which have always been regarded as the two pivotal points of action in his career, and in which his decision and courage have been deemed worthy of special praise. But with Catiline and Antony alike he kept off and on, blowing hot and cold, until the last moment. And what finally roused him to action in each case was the necessities of the party of the senate, in whose eyes he, with the feeling natural to a *novus homo*, always aimed to appear well, together with his own innate love for precedent and order, and his desire to keep

ffairs on their old footing, a desire which, though always ;rong, never rose to effort until some impulse from without ad overcome its inertia.

The Letters of Cicero are the best which antiquity has ft us, and among the best of any time. And their excel- nce as letters arises quite as much from his moral or oluntary weakness as from his intellectual strength. His haracter was so little pronounced, with so few rough oints, and so feeble a bias towards any one direction, that it as easy for him to make himself one for the time being ith the person addressed. His rare versatility and tact nabled him to project himself into, to appreciate nicely, and adapt his thoughts, tone, and diction to the sentiments of ll. And while doing this he completely revealed himself. t is much to be regretted that so large a part of his corre- pondence has been lost, as it would have added so much to ur pleasure and profit, and to our knowledge of him as a an. So humiliating are the revelations made of himself in is letters to his brother Quintus, to that "afflicted woman 'erentia," his wife, and to his friend Atticus during exile, at Wieland declared that it would have been well for his eputation if his freedman Tiro, who probably first collected em, had burned them all. His reputation might indeed ave been better, but not so true. We should, then, have nown him with more or less correctness, as the orator, atesman, and philosopher, but we should have totally mis- onceived him as Cicero. These letters are invaluable, as ey show better than all the others how he lived, moved, nd had his being in private life, when he was not mounted n stilts, nor acting a part, nor under restraint from position r office; and all the more so, as they were penned at a time f trial singularly adapted to test and to make known in aked truth the stuff he was made of. We could not at all ispense with these letters if we would know the living, ousehold Cicero. Merivale remarks of them that they xhibit the writings of a mind which wreaks upon friends e torments of self-dissatisfaction, and that, from his ten- ency to exaggerate his feelings, they contain an overcharged icture of his imbecility. They have, it seems to us, that uth which chiefly concerns us—truth to character. It is t least the flitting truth of the moment, if it is not the truth f every moment and every month. These letters fix the icero of the minute. He did not think and feel thus all the ime, for he was the creature of moods, and given to many

sudden ups and downs. But that he was capable of thinking and feeling thus at some times is unquestionable; and this is a truth which we cannot afford to lose.

The other letters of Cicero—*Ad Familiares*—exhibit him generally in a more pleasing light. Middleton, Niebuhr, the Abbè Mongault, Melmoth, Merivale, De Quincey, and Forsyth, have given eloquent testimony to their charm, elegance, and variety, and to the perennial interest which attaches to them. Starting from widely different standpoints; bearing the outflow of shifting moods; disclosing the inmost thoughts of a sleepless intellect; the aims, the plans, and the deeds of an agile protagonist in the world's arena, and the recesses of a morbidly impressible spirit; reflecting constantly, and often with a naive unconsciousness, the hot temper of the times; addressed to all classes, for every conceivable purpose, in every variety of tone and diction; accommodating themselves with singular felicity to the idiosyncrasies of each correspondent—these letters remain the delight of each succeeding age. They embody, still fresh for us, the culture of the scholar, the speculations of the philosopher, the views of the statesman, the periods of the orator, the gusts and schemes of the politician, the countless activities of the man of the world, the thoughts of the moralist, the opinions and sentiments of the connoisseur, the *otium cum dignitate* of the gentleman-farmer, the raillery of the wit, the tastes, digestion, and experience of the accomplished diner-out, the quick thoughts of the supple conversationist, and the *tout ensemble* of the citizen and man of family. Combined with these, it is pleasant to find—always the tact, oftentimes the delicacy and sensitiveness, and now and then the tenderness and sympathy, of woman. And it gives us no inferior joy to catch glimpses of fine golden threads running here and there, twisted of the sportive freshness, the fun, the frank simplicity, and the artless prattle of childhood. We see him, in short, running over the gamut of thoughts, sentiments, and moods, scandal, and all manner of gossip, sound sense and delightful nonsense. Forsyth speaks of his letters as harping ever on the vanity of ambition and the worthlessness of popular applause, and says: "We would not willingly exchange that letter to Atticus, in which he says of himself that he knows he has acted like a "genuine donkey" (*me asinum germanum fuisse*), for the stiffest and most elaborate of his political epistles." He gives an inside view of his real opinions about politics, measures, and men, exhibiting often-

times, a singular running commentary on his opinions as advocated in public; chats, weeps, grovels, and grows ecstatic in his domestic scribblings to Terentia and Tullia; discusses wit, mouldy cheese, sausages, literature, epicurism, and good cookery with Papirius Pætus; tells many friends of his fasts, feasts, and dietings, his love for this or that dish, what his notions are about the science of good cheer, and writes from the very midst of a banquet to say how dearly he loves festivity—albeit he is not addicted to gallantry; tells Varro how he reads and walks, what he is studying, thinking about, and writing; does not scruple to boast freely of his own great deeds, possibly boring his correspondents not a little with the familiar egotism; descants unreservedly on the excellence of his own letters, justly remarking that much of their merit is derived from their great resemblance to conversation; writes, *in forma mendicantis*, to Lucceius one of the most absurd letters ever left behind by a great man, begging for an extravagant laudation of his own consulship, measures, and deeds, in the history which Lucceius is proposing to write; and then, being much gratified with this singular performance, writes to Atticus to ask Lucceius for the privilege of a squint at the epistolary treasure; eats his own words, stoutly denies having had anything to do with the scandal which his hand had actually penned, and contradicts in one letter what he had just written in another; convicts himself of duplicity and insincerity towards Cato, Pompey, Cæsar, Antony, Crasus, Appius, Pulcher, Piso, Gabinius, Vatinius, Ptolemy, and others, and even on one occasion towards his best loved friend Atticus; and writes much special pleading to Lentulus to vindicate his consistency; writes to his dear freedman Tiro missives running over with affection,—on one occasion despatching three within twenty-four hours, and brimful of commissions, advice, and vagaries,—giving directions regarding business, the house, the library, the copyists, health, and regimen, sending an artistic cook for the greater well-being of the faithful servitor, and always professing undying attachment; praises the country, and longs for retirement, and says that Rome is the only place—there's no place like Rome; beseeches Cœlius to send all the gossip of the metropolis to the exiled proconsul in Cilicia, promising in return the desired panthers and other favors; talks with Fabius Gallus about his pictures and statues, vents his spleen freely on his intimates when in the mood, and jokes in every vein of wit and

humor with Atticus, Volumnius, Cornificius, Valerius the pettifogger, Papirius, and the much-quizzed Trebatius, a Roman barrister in full practice among British barbarians; proposes to one correspondent that each should write under an *alias*, and with another, agrees upon private marks in his letters to indicate the real weight to be attached to his recommendations of particular persons; now attests himself free from vainglory, then confesses his immoderate love of praise, and proves his consistency by continually setting forth his great deeds, and always fishing for compliments; introduces neat little dissertations concerning philosophy, statecraft, men, business, pleasure, morals, manners, laughter, and all sorts of agreeable trifles, as well as *de omni scibili*; dating his versatile effusions at all hours and from all places, before sunrise, in the garden, the study, the senate-chamber, at a friend's house, from a dinner party, in the midst of an argument, oration, official duties, or authorship, from his town-residence and his dozen different country-seats, from all parts of Italy and the regions round about, and from far Cilicia.

We have aimed in this article, as our title indicates, to present the negative side of Cicero, rather than the positive. And from this stand-point it seems to us a deeper insight and a clearer conception of his real character may be gained than from any other; for as a man he was by nature more distinguished by what he was not in point of character than by what he was. Still the true complement to our view would be one from the other side, representing whatever was positive in him and in his relations to the world. De Quincey remarks, that in the revolution of the republic the only great actor who stood upon the authority of his character, was Cicero. This may be true or not according as it is taken; according—employing the distinction set forth above—as we conceive the word character as denoting a moral or a voluntary element. True if character means comparative freedom from vice and personal purity; not true if it implies the magnetic will, and indicates the existence of traits in themselves distinctive, positive, and salient in any degree. Cicero carried no weight: there seemed nothing behind him. Once, descanting on the character of Cato, he spoke of him as one whose weight of opinion was equal to one hundred thousand. But Cicero himself calls to mind the man from Crotona, whose opinions had little authority, but who spoke as if he had come from a great city.

Mommsen's stern dissection of the nerveless orator may not be entirely just; but he is not far from the truth when he says, that in the politics of the time Cicero's authority carried no weight; that as a statesman he was "*ohne Einsicht, Ansicht, und Absicht.*"

ART. VI.—1. *How our National Debt may be a National Blessing, &c.* By SAMUEL WILKESON. Issued by Jay Cooke, General Subscription Agent of the Government Loans. Pamphlet. Philadelphia, 1865.

2. *An Inquiry concerning the Rise and Progress, the Redemption and Present State and the Management of the National Debt of Great Britain.* Fourth Edition. By ROBERT HAMILTON, LL.D., F.R.S.E. Edinburgh.

3. *Elements of a Plan for the Liquidation of the National Debt of Great Britain, &c.* By RICHARD HEATHFIELD. London.

4. *Histoire financière de France.—Histoire financière d'Angleterre.* Par M. BAILLY. Paris.

5. *Du Systeme financier.* Paris.

ON no subject have political economists differed so much as on the influence of a large public debt on the interests of the nation. The author of the pamphlet at the head of this article is by no means peculiar in the opinion that "a national debt may be a national blessing." Statesmen like William Pitt and the late Sir Robert Peel have maintained the same theory, although only when in need of money for other purposes. But Mr. Wilkeson makes a very serious omission; he assigns no reasons, adduces no arguments, exhibits no authorities in support of his statements. If a king, emperor, or president takes up his pen to advocate views which are at variance with those entertained by the general public, it becomes incumbent on him to make some effort to prove that he is right. The most illustrious statesmen or lawgivers have not considered themselves exempt from this duty. Any one who does must not wonder if he is misunderstood, misrepresented, or even ridiculed. There is many an important fact which, if stated dogmatically, without any explanation of the principles upon which it is founded, would seem ridiculous even to intelligent men; whereas, if the

person putting it forward took the pains to explain those most ready to sneer might be the first to adopt his views instead of laughing at him.

However, we like the spirit in which the pamphlet is written; if it is not exactly true that a national debt is a national blessing, it is better that we should regard it in that light than as a national curse, which would excite discouragement and discontent. If one gets his arm broken, it is much more philosophical for him to thank God that it was not his neck, and go to the surgeon as soon as he can, than to sit down and whine and tell his friends how unfortunate he has been, until mortification sets in.

Even when a debt has been needlessly contracted, it is much better to try to pay it off good humoredly than to grumble over it. But has not our debt been unavoidable? What will justify a nation in borrowing if not the preservation of its life? If an individual pays any amount, however great, to save his life, when he could not have saved it at a less price, would not any one who grumbled at his doing so show that he valued the money more than his friend? It has cost us a considerable number of millions, it is true, to save the Republic from dismemberment, but is it not worth a hundred times as many more?

The only fair questions then are, Is the management of the debt in judicious and trustworthy hands? Will it be increased as little as possible? Are all proper means to be adopted for its liquidation in a reasonable time? We think there are few who, from the experience of the past, will not answer at least the first and second query in the affirmative. It is this fact which gives Mr. Wilkeson's pamphlet all the importance it possesses; had it come to us bearing on its title-page the names of officials or agents who had misused or mismanaged the public money, we should either have thrown it aside altogether, or denounced it as we do every performance that reaches us, whose object it is, in our opinion, to impose on public credulity.

We will now proceed to examine Mr. Wilkeson's pamphlet, and try to do so in a fair and candid spirit, cheerfully accepting as truth whatever we can regard in that light, but as freely pointing out error wherever we think we detect it. First, we are presented with a table of the indebtedness of the four great powers of Europe, together with that of the United States, the interest paid by each government, &c., which we copy:

	Debt.	Interest.	Debt per Capita.	Ratio Interest to yearly Produce.
, 1863.....	$2,541,274,806	$132,360,000	$62.12	
, 1864.....	1,263,400,000	75,100,000	36.00	
1864.....	1,116,800,000	27,100,000	19.64	
Britain, 1863..	4,006,942,117	127,564,548	129.33	3.81
States.....	3,000,000,000	165,000,000	86.72	3.63

ese debts Mr. Wilkeson calls permanent; so they are nent, inasmuch as it is found difficult, or impossible, to em; but not one of the governments of Europe would to retain its debt as a source of wealth or any benefit nation. Perhaps there is not a single cabinet, one of members does not regard the national debt as our r does; but in no cabinet would a majority be found aining the same opinion. This, we think, is as it to be, and we will give our reasons for that impression we close. In the meantime, we will briefly examine of the secondary statements of Mr. Wilkeson. The is: "We can easily pay our debt." If the word ly" were omitted, we think this would be correct gh, especially as it is not meant that the present gene- should pay all. "Our ability," he says, "to pay our debt has been demonstrated by an exhibit of the re- es of the nation."

at these resources are immense none can question; it is in glory or exaggeration to say that they are greater those of any other country; but, boundless as they are, old that it would be impossible to demonstrate, by any ss whatever, that they could be "easily" made pay three and millions; that is a much larger sum than Mr. eson seems to have calculated with any degree of accu-

But, if he be correct, it would be better not to pay it had it in our power; our doing so would be not a ing, but a misfortune, for the simple reason that "our is *just as much capital added to our wealth.*"

he funded debt of the United States is, he says, in effect the addition ee thousand millions of dollars to the previously realized wealth of tion. It is three thousand millions added to its available active l. To pay this debt would be to extinguish this capital and to lose ealth. To extinguish this capital and lose this wealth would be an eivably great national misfortune."

This conclusion he arrives at by taking England as an ple; but except in a few instances, and under certain

conditions, English statesmen have always regarded the subject in a very different light ; as have the statesmen of every country in Europe. No other subject has occupied the attention of political economists so much as to devise some project by which the national debt could be paid off in the shortest possible time. All the books that have been written upon it, even within the present century, would make quite a large library by themselves. At least a hundred different plans have been proposed by as many writers, including cabinet ministers, jurists, college professors, divines, &c. Even the project of paying the national debt by contribution was by no means new when proposed in this country some months ago by one of our leading journals. Substantially the same proposition had been made on the same grounds half a century previously, by no less a personage than the Bishop of Landaff, who wrote a pamphlet on the subject, maintaining that, if all could not be paid by subscription just then, the nation ought, "at least, pay that part which has been added to it by the Seven Years' War, by the American war, by the last war, and by this." The Edinburgh Review of the time, in commenting on this project, remarks: "Bishop Watson proposes that we should take the present opportunity to pay off the whole of the national debt. He urges, on behalf of this bold scheme, a good number of *declamatory reasons*, such as *the terror with which so grand an operation would* strike our enemies, and the advantage of lessening the great imposthume growing on the body politic before its bursting proves fatal.*"

It is needless to observe that all propositions for the payment of the debt have been made on the ground that it was a burden which it was at least inconvenient to carry; nay, was it not for this reason that the sinking fund was established? Is it not for the same reason that every government in Europe, whose financial affairs are judiciously managed, is at this moment doing all it conveniently can to discharge its debt?

But Mr. Wilkeson tells us that "the interest of the debt only becomes the measure of its burden. Great Britain," he says, "does owe to Great Britain *confessedly* four thousand millions. But, practically, and by consent and harmonious arrangement, Great Britain owes to Great Britain only one

* *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1804, Art. "Bishop Watson on the National Debt, &c."

hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars a year; and that is a very small debt for the proprietors and workmen of the 'workshop of the world' to owe to each other." (p. 4.) This is exceedingly loose sort of logic. It requires little argument to prove that no debt can be said to be paid unless the creditor receive the principal as well as the interest; it is equally evident that, if the money is to be paid, it must come out of the pocket either of the debtor or his successors; and this is the principle on which the English funding system, which our author takes as a model, is founded.

The benefit of compound interest, which accrues to a nation in its transactions with the public creditor, is what England depends upon chiefly for the payment of her debt. She borrows the money at simple interest, and gets compound interest for it; she appropriates certain portions of the public revenue to the half-yearly payment of the interest, and also to defray the expenses of management. The sinking fund is thus caused to increase at such a ratio—the surplus of taxation being added to it—that, if no new debt is contracted, millions can be paid from it annually towards diminishing the public burden. Those acquainted with the principle of compound interest will readily understand this; its wonderful power of increase is well illustrated by Mr. Price. "A *penny*," says that gentleman, "so improved from our Saviour's birth as to double itself every fourteen years, or, which is nearly the same, put out to five per cent. interest at our Saviour's birth, would by this time have increased to *more money than would be contained in one hundred and fifty millions of globes, each equal to the earth in magnitude, and all solid gold.*"*

This seems extravagant; but it is very near the truth. Yet, if we examine the facts, we shall see what slow progress it makes even in times of profound peace. As Mr. Wilkeson bases all his statements on the debt of England, we will draw our data, for the present, from the same source. From a cursory glance, we find that in 1722 the national debt of England amounted only to fifty-five millions. For seventeen years afterwards she enjoyed profound peace. During the whole of this period the funding system was in operation, yet the debt was diminished only eight millions. Thus, when the Spanish war commenced in 1739, the debt amounted to

* See preface to Price's Observations on Reversionary Payments. Third edition, London, 1845.

forty-seven millions; at the close of that war, in 1748, it had increased to £78,293,312. From this we see that a comparatively insignificant war of nine years added about four times as much to the national debt as a continued peace of seventeen years had taken from it.

When the war against the American colonies commenced in 1776, the national debt of the mother country amounted to £135,943,051; at the close of the war, in 1783, it had increased to £238,484,870—that is, the seven years' war against her colonies cost her £102,541,819. This was followed by ten years of peace; but at the end of that period the debt was reduced only about four millions and a half—not half a million a year. When the war of the French Revolution commenced, the debt of England was £233,733,609, and before the peace of 1801, it more than doubled, being £561,203,274. The peace which followed this, instead of diminishing the debt to a considerable extent, *added forty millions to it.* Thus has the debt continued to increase in peace and war for nearly a century, until it has attained its present enormous dimensions, although the sinking fund has been in operation all the time.

But had the result been otherwise—had a large amount of the debt been discharged, it would have been at the expense of the nation. The following formula will illustrate this: Suppose a state whose revenue arises from taxation to borrow $20,000,000 at five per cent. interest. It is obvious that as long as this debt remains unpaid the country must submit to a taxation of one million a year for the interest alone. But if $200,000 of the principal is paid, the interest on that amount is no longer due to the creditor; this is equal to a saving of $10,000 a year to government—the same as if that amount were added to its revenue. But let us suppose that, instead of devoting this amount to any other purpose, the government hands it over to the public creditor in addition to the $200,000; then it is clear that $210,000 of of the debt will be extinguished. Now, if, instead of paying in this manner, the government had lent the $200,000, at compound interest, payable half yearly, it would have amounted to just the same amount in one year; that is, the $200,000 would have brought $10,000. When the creditor has received this $210,000 of principal, he is entitled to no further interest on any part of the amount, and the result is the same as if $10,500 were added to the yearly revenue. Without extending the formula, it may be remarked that, in general,

at the end of any number of years, the debt extinguished in this manner will be equal to the capital which would have been produced in the same time if the $200,000 had been lent to accumulate by compound interest. But, in either case, how is this money obtained? Is it produced out of nothing by the magical power of compound interest? Not a penny of it! Every dollar which has been appropriated to the extinction of the principal debt, as well as every dollar paid for the interest of what remains unextinguished, is raised by taxation. If this be not sufficiently clear, let any intelligent person ask himself what is to be gained by discharging a debt with borrowed money, if as high interest is to be paid for the latter as for the former. But Mr. Wilkeson sees a great difference between individual debt and government debt, and tells us how, as follows:

"The difference between the debt of an individual and the debt of a government is *as broad as the difference between night and day*. The holder of an individual's promise to pay watchfully expects pay-day, and demands payment. A great government, like that of England, is not importuned to pay its funded debt—*is practically begged not to pay it*—practically entreated to *keep the money forever*, and only to pay the interest twice a year. Demand for long credit by an individual is accepted all over the world as a measure of inability to pay, and lenders lock their chests and put their hands behind their backs. On the other hand, the longer the credit asked by the government of the United States, the more eager are lenders to lend. The longest government loans are highest priced and most sought. Investments love repose next to security. *The life of a government, founded on the will of an intelligent people, is enduring*. The contingency of the death of an individual is an element in the measure of his credit. It affects personal credit in every case. This contingency never affects the credit of a government. The holders of its bonds never have to negotiate with heirs or executors, nor watch with solicitude the administration of an estate whose relations have all been changed by the sudden removal of its manager. *The debt of a constitutional government*, like that of Great Britain or the United States, is accepted among men *as absolutely sure and perfectly safe*. It is not possible for an individual's debt ever to attain to this character of perpetuated and perfect value."—p. 7.

That the holders of United States bonds are perfectly safe we have not the least doubt. There is no bank in Europe or America in which we have more confidence; we entirely agree with Mr. Wilkeson that, as long as the public funds are managed so judiciously as they are now, there is no safer investment, and, consequently, that the longer the credit asked by the government, the more profitable is the investment to the lender. Nor do we mean to question that the government of England is perfectly solvent, or that there is any serious risk in investing in its stock. At the same

time, Mr. Wilkeson is very much mistaken in the opinion that, because a nation is great and powerful, it follows that its bonds must always be "absolutely sure and perfectly safe." The most cursory glance at the financial history of England alone ought to have satisfied him on this point.

How can the bonds of any country be said to be "perfectly safe" when it finds it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to raise sufficient funds for its current expenses? And how often has England been in this position? Nay, how often have her bond-holders suffered? Did not the very minister who had assumed so much credit for establishing the sinking fund, and who had so often represented it as absolutely necessary to *save the nation from ruin*, lay violent hands upon it by appropriating a million of its produce to the supplies of the year? To this day the most serious charge made against William Pitt, as a statesman, is that he was always too ready to increase the national debt, and, consequently, to enlarge the burden of taxation.

We have never met an intelligent Englishman yet who would seriously maintain that England has sustained no injury from her enormous national debt, not to mention its being a blessing to her. If all Englishmen did so, the world would know that they were wrong. What, for example, but her debt caused her to provoke her American colonies to rebellion? It was precisely because the British minister had to raise £4,840,821, in taxes, to pay the interest on the national debt, and found it extremely difficult to do so, that the Stamp Act was introduced into the House of Commons in March, 1764, at his instigation, and passed the following year by that body, in order that the colonies might be made "*to bear a part, at least, of the burden that oppressed the mother country.*" Can Mr. Wilkeson deny this? Was it a blessing that thus placed England in a position that led to the loss of her best colonies? To the latter, indeed, it was a blessing, but it was the most humiliating blow that ever England had to bear.

Nor shall we find any better results arising from the operation of the national debt if we turn to any of the other European states included in Mr. Wilkeson's table. We need not go beyond France, which is the first on his list. That country has, indeed, a large debt; but we have never heard it urged that it was beneficial to the nation, or even that it has not proved injurious; but the reverse we have heard and seen often enough, and we are convinced that it is true. So early as 1715, St. Simon proposed to the regent

o assemble the States-General and declare a general bankuptcy on account of the burden of the national debt. All he principal historians of France admit that its great ncrease, caused by the wars of Louis XIII. and of Louis XIV., contributed more to the fall of Louis XVI. than any ther cause. But we have still clearer evidence than this, hat a large national debt is neither so good nor so sure as Mr. Wilkeson would have his readers believe. Thus we find hat, in 1798, the bonds of France, known as *deux tiers* were epreciated almost immediately to the extent of 70 to 0 per cent. In a very short time they became utterly orthless, and, as a necessary consequence, the government ecame bankrupt. But Mr. Wilkeson may tell us that this as a mere matter of form, so far as the public creditors were oncerned, because a government debt is so widely different rom an individual debt. But such proved not to be the fact n this as in many other cases; for the failure of the governent to meet its payments, as stipulated, was productive of he greatest suffering. In the language of the historian, two undred thousand families found themselves ruined in a ingle day; a multitude who had been living on rents, penions, and the proceeds of their labor, and all they had to pare, were reduced to the most frightful misery.*

Mr. Wilkeson places great stress on the form of governent. In the extract we have given, from page 7 of his amphlet, he tells us that "the life of a government, founded n the will of an intelligent people, is enduring," and that the debt of a constitutional government is accepted as erfectly safe," &c. It is certainly true that, if a country ay be blessed by imposing a heavy debt upon it, no governents are entitled to so much credit as constitutional governents, since they excel all others in producing large debts. he reader need only turn to Mr. Wilkeson's own table in rder to understand this. It shows that constitutional ngland has nearly four times as large a debt as despotic ussia; more than three times as large a debt as Austria; nd nearly twice as large a debt as France. Thus, in proporion as a country is more despotic than another, it has a maller debt, and *vice versa*. But the disparity between the ebts of the different countries *per capita* is still greater.

* Plus de deux cent mille familles se trouvèrent ruinées en un seul jour. Une ultitude de rentiers et de pensionnaires perdirent tout à coup le fruit de leurs avaux et de leurs epargnes, et se trouvèrent dans la plus affreuse misère.—*M. yacinthe Maury.*

Thus the English debt *per capita* amounts to $129.33, while that of Russia amounts only to $19.64; that is, every Englishman has to pay *more than five times as much annually for the public debt as every Russian* has; every American has to pay more than *four times as much* as every Russian, &c. It may be some consolation to the Englishman or the American that, if he has to pay a larger tax than his neighbor, it has been imposed upon him, not by one person, but by a score or a hundred; which would be about the same as to prefer paying six dollars or four dollars to a company of hatters for a hat, rather than pay one dollar to one hatter who had the power of selling his hats as he chose, or keeping them all to himself, if that pleased him better.

Nor is it always true that it is safer to deal with six men, or even five hundred, than with one. As it is our disposition, as well as our duty, rather to tell the truth than to laud any form of government further than we think it deserves it, we must remind our author that it is precisely when and where the people have had most power that the public creditors have fared worst. It is well known that Cromwell was more anxious to enrich his friends and supporters than he was to pay the public creditors. And be it remembered that it was the republic of France—not the monarchy—that repudiated its debts in the manner indicated above, and brought ruin on hundreds of thousands. Here was a popular government, but was it safe and enduring on that account? Was there not more safety, as well as more stability, under the despotic government established by Napoleon I.?

We do not mean by this that a despotism is better than a republic or as good; none appreciate the superior advantages of the latter more highly than we do ourselves; but that is no reason why we should give it credit for virtues which it is notorious it does not possess. On the contrary, the weak point of a popular government is the facility with which it accumulates debt. It is this facility which best explains the difference between the several debts of the five great powers as exhibited in Mr. Wilkeson's table; for it cannot be pretended that France and Russia are not as warlike nations as England. Still less can it be pretended that those governments could not tax their people, if so disposed, to as burdensome an extent as England; if they did not possess this power, it would be absurd to call them despotic.

Nor is the superior stability, or durability, claimed by Mr. Wilkeson for popular governments as a guarantee of safety

to their creditors, founded on any stronger basis. The history of the world shows but too plainly that the reverse is the fact. It is not necessary to go back to the republics of Greece or Rome for proof of this; we have illustrations enough in modern times. What, for example, has become of the republic of Venice, with all its glory and power? What of the Dutch republic, that set at defiance the imperial power of Spain in her palmiest days? Has not England herself had a republic, and how long did it last? Has not France had a republic twice, and how long did it "endure" either time? What security did it afford the public creditor?

It is obvious, then, that, if we ought to feel no particular uneasiness about our debt, it is not because the form of our government is republican, because it is founded on the will of the people, or because it bears a resemblance to the government of England or any other country. The truth is that the nature of a large public debt, or the influence which it is likely to produce on the nation, is as great a mystery to "the people" as the quadrature of the circle, or the magic stone of the alchemist, which is to transmute all metals into gold. The opinion, or the vote, of one person who understands a subject is of more value than that of five thousand who do not understand it; and hence it is but natural, after all, that the masses may denounce or execrate to-day what they hurrahed and threw up their hats for yesterday; for it is now just as true as when Horace wrote his beautiful ode, *Ad fortunam*, that the will of the mob is a very precarious foundation to build upon:

> "At vulgus *infidum*, et meretrix retro
> Perjura cedit."

The reason why we think there is no cause for alarm, notwithstanding the vast amount of our debt, is that not only are our resources almost boundless, but our situation and circumstances are such that we can use them in time to the best advantage. It is these resources which constitute our wealth according as they are made available; they are so much added to our wealth; the debt is certainly not an addition to our wealth as asserted by Mr. Wilkeson; it is more correct to regard it as so much deducted from that wealth. We hold, also, that the only effectual way to discharge the national debt is by the overplus of profits afforded by those resources when made available; and that the sooner it is paid without having recourse to any violent means, or without prejudice to vested rights, the better for the nation.

Hitherto we have adduced only our own views and arguments in refuting the assertions of Mr. Wilkeson; but we do not assume that these ought to be accepted by our readers if we cannot show that they are corroborated in every important particular by writers on political economy, and especially on this particular branch of it, who are recognized as authorities. None will deny, we dare say, that Professor Hamilton may be regarded in this light. Now we will ask the reader to remember what wonderful efficacy Mr. Wilkeson ascribes to the funding system, and then hear what the professor has to say on the subject. "Convinced," says Dr. Hamilton," that the sinking fund has contributed *nothing* to the discharge of the public debt, that it has occasioned a large *addition to our public burthens*, we next enquire whether any and what advantages have been derived from it. The means, and *the only means*, of restraining the progress of national debt are saving of expenditure and increase of revenue. Neither of these have a necessary connection with a sinking fund. But if they have an eventual connection, and if the nation, impressed with a conviction of the importance of a system established by a popular minister, has, in order to adhere to it, adopted measures, either of frugality in expenditure, or exertion in raising taxes, which it would not otherwise have done, the sinking fund ought not to be considered as inefficient; and its effects may be of great importance. We are not of opinion that the sinking fund has contributed *in any degree to frugality in expenditure*. The time during which it has operated has not been a time of national frugality. Ministers have had the full power of raising what loans they pleased to supply the means of any expenditure, *however lavish*; and it will not be said they have used this power with a saving hand. In regard to increase of taxes, we are of opinion that the sinking fund has had a real effect in calling forth exertions which, although they might have been made as well and as effectually, would not have been made unless to follow out the line which that system required. A loan is made, and the revenue is considered as charged not only with the interest, but a certain proportion of the principal annually. Taxes are imposed *to meet the one as well as the other*. If the sinking fund had not been in view, it is likely taxes would have been imposed *for the interest only*.*

Now let the reader bear in mind the distinction which Mr

* An inquiry concerning the Rise and Progress, &c., of the National Debt, by Robert Hamilton, LL.D., F.R.S.E., p. 158.

Wilkeson draws between a public and a private debt, which he informs us are as different from each other as night is from day. Prof. Hamilton, however, like all other writers of eminence, is of the opposite opinion; and he illustrates his view of the subject as follows: "A private gentleman, whose estate is encumbered, may, if he have any credit, pay off all his debt every year by *borrowing money from other hands;* but if he *spends more than his free income,* his embarrassments will continually increase; and his affairs are so much the worse by being conducted in this manner, from the fees he pays to his agents. The *absurdity of deriving any satisfaction* from this annual discharge of his debts will appear still stronger if we suppose him, instead of borrowing from other hands, only to renew the securities to the same creditors, annually paying a fee to the agents, and a *douceur* to the creditors themselves, on the renewal. *All these observations are equally applicable to the debt of a nation conducted as ours is.* It would not be impracticable or very difficult to redeem our whole debt in any year if the measures we follow be redemption. It would only require a large loan every month; and the large sums we were thus enabled to pay would supply the funds for these loans. Our capitalists would be well pleased to promote these loans, as they would derive a *bonus* from each. Such a system *would be ruinous in the extreme;* and the system we follow is the same on a smaller scale, and is therefore only pernicious in a less degree."*

Although Mr. Wilkeson does not seem to have very carefully studied the subject upon which he has written, we have little doubt that, if he were asked who is the most reliable British writer on political economy, he would not hesitate to award that distinction to Dr. Adam Smith, author of *The Wealth of Nations.* The superior authority of this work is universally acknowledged throughout the Continent, as well as in England; but does the author agree with Mr. Wilkeson in regarding the debt of a nation as an addition to the nation's wealth? We shall presently see. The chief means of increasing the public debt is war; then, if a large permanent debt is a blessing, surely war cannot be very seriously condemned, notwitstanding its manifold horrors, though it be productive of no other benefit to those who carry it on. But, in commenting on this branch of the subject, Dr. Smith observes: "Had not these wars given this particular direction to so large a capital, the greater part of it would natu-

* *Ib.*, p. 191.

rally have been employed *in maintaining productive hands*, whose labor would have replaced, *with a profit, the whole value of their consumption.* The value of the annual produce of the land and labor of the country would have been *considerably increased* by it every year; and every year's increase would have still more augmented that of the following year. More houses would have been built, more lands would have been improved, and those which had been improved before would have been better cultivated; more manufactures would have been established, and those which had been established before would have been more extended; and to what height the real wealth and revenue of the country might by this time have been raised it is not perhaps very easy even to imagine.*

Perhaps Mr. Hume exaggerated the danger of the national debt of England when the stated, in his "Essay on the Public Credit," that either the country must destroy the debt, or the debt will destroy the country; it is sufficient for us to know that the most profound thinkers of Great Britain have regarded the national debt in a very different light from that of a blessing.

Nor do the political economists of Italy, France, or Germany take a more favorable view of its operations or influence. "A country," says Ricardo, "which has involved itself in the difficulties attendant on a large public debt would act wisely in ransoming itself from them, at the sacrifice of any portion of its property which might be necessary for the redemption of the debt." Those who have most debt to pay are apt to think most on the subject; and accordingly we find that next to the English, of all Europeans, the French have written most on national debt. If any of them have maintained that it is a blessing, the fact has escaped our attention, or our memory. "The habit, or necessity of living by expedients," says M. Maury, "is *not less dangerous for nations than for individuals.* In casting itself into the easy way of loans, the nation places itself on a rapid declivity, where it is no longer possible for it to stop; and at the bottom of which it almost always falls into that *abyss of misery and shame which is called national bankruptcy*" †

---

* Wealth of Nations, vol. ii., p. 119, McCulloch's edition.

† L'habitude ou a nécessité de vivre d'expédients n'est pas moins dangereux pour les peuples que pour les individus. En se jetant dans la voie facile des emprunts on s'est placé sur une pente rapide, où il n'était plus possible de s'arrêter, et au bout de laquelle on est presque toujours tombé dans cet abîme de misére et de honte qu'on appelle la banqueroute publique.—*Hist. financiere de la France, par M. Bresson, tome* ii., *p.* 250.

If we inquire who is the greatest authority among celebrated writers, we shall find that it is Montesquieu, the illustrious author of *De l'Esprit des Lois*: then, if we examine his ample pages, we shall see that neither Professor Hamilton, Mr. Hume, Dr. Adam Smith, nor any other writer whatever is more decided in the opinion that a large national debt is injurious to any nation that is burdened with it. Not but in Montesquieu's time as well as now there were persons who believed that it was no harm, but rather good, for a nation to be indebted to itself. "Quelques gens," says the philosopher, "ont cru quil étoit bon qu'un etat dût à luimême; ils ont pensé que cela multiplioit les richesses en augmentant la circulation."* This shows that the ideas of Mr. Wilkeson are at least more than a century old, but it also shows that even then they had been exploded as fallacious. Montesquieu explains how the mistake occurs on a superficial view. He shows the disadvantages which a nation labors under by being burdened with a large debt, and then admits that, if there are advantages arising from the same cause, he does not know in what they consist. "Volá les inconvéniens," he says, "je n'en connois point les avantages." He then proceeds to illustrate his view. If ten persons, he says, have each a thousand crowns of revenue in landed funds or business, this produces for the nation, at five per cent., a capital of two hundred thousand crowns. If these ten persons employ the half of their revenue, that is to say, five thousand crowns, to pay the interest on the hundred thousand crowns they have borrowed from others, that still produces for the state but two hundred thousand crowns; that is, in the language of the algebraists, 200,000 crowns—100,000 crowns + 100,000 crowns = 200,000 crowns."†

He now shows how the mistake is generally made, namely by regarding paper which is but the representative of money or wealth as the thing itself. But we will let the philosopher give the idea in his own language: "Ce que peut jeter dans l'erreur," he says "c'est qu'un papier qui représente la dette d'une nation est un signe de richesse; car *il n'y a qu'un etat riche qui puisse soutenir un tel papier sans tomber dans la décadence;* que s'il n'y tombe pas il faut que l'état ait de grandes riches d'ailleurs." This is undoubtedly the philosophy of the subject—that is, instead of a large public debt adding to the wealth of a country, none but a rich coun-

* De l'esprit de Lois, liv. xxii, chap. xvii. † *Ib.*

try can sustain a large debt, or save itself from decay. If a country is rich notwithstanding its great debt, it is not on account of the debt, it is so but in spite of it; in other words, if it does not break down under the pressure of the debt, it is because it has great riches independently of it. This is the case with us as well as with England. Our seven-thirty bonds are safe and productive capital to those who invest in them, not because our national debt is large, but because we have almost inexhaustible resources, and possess sufficient enterprise, industry, and skill to turn those resources to the best advantage.

As Mr. Wilkeson makes the debt of England the criterion whereby we are to judge in every particular of the effects of our debt, ought he not to have reminded us that we have accumulated our debt at a much larger ratio than England. England has been engaged in more wars in one decade than we have been during the whole period of our existence, and her enemies have been the most powerful and most warlike nations in the world. Not only has she had to support her own army, but also to pay large subsidies to the armies of her continental allies; there have always been some of her colonies from which she has derived no revenue, but which have been a loss to her rather than a gain. At other times, she has found it necessary to make war on her colonies thousands of miles from home. We have had only to protect ourselves at home, with the broad Atlantic between us and all the great powers. Yet, if we compare our debt with that of England, what a near approach does the former make to the latter! Why, if we are to regard the interest as the measure of the burden, as we are told to do by Mr. Wilkeson, our debt is the largest in the world, not excepting that of England, which has been accumulating for nearly four centuries. In the comparative table already referred to, the interest of the debt of the United States is given as $165,000,000, and that of the debt of Great Britain as $127,564,548. It is important not only that this fact should be known, but that it should be remembered and pondered upon, so that it may exercise a salutary influence on future expenditures.

But if we have thus felt it our duty to refute certain erroneous theories of Mr. Wilkeson, we are not the less disposed to give him credit for any theory or suggestion that is founded on reason and truth; and we regard in this light the statement that "the national debt will be the bond of our Union;" for there are many things that are not good in themselves,

but the reverse, which, by producing a community of interest and feeling, serve to unite in one brotherhood those who might otherwise be at constant enmity with each other. But we will let Mr. Wilkeson state the case in his own words:

"This, our national war debt, should be held forever in place as the political tie of the states and the bond forever of a fraternal nationality. It will give a common interest in the Union that nothing else can give. It will impart to a copartnership between thirty-five millions of people the unity of feeling arising from a community of interest in a copartnership capital of three thousand millions of dollars. Tied to the Union by the Union debt, nor Western States, nor Southern States—states beyond the Rocky Mountains, nor states by the Atlantic Sea—states that plant, nor states that weave—states that mine, nor states that smelt and hammer, can ever find inducement in sectional interest to draw asunder from each other. The proprietary interest of the voters of the several states in the national debt will be sufficient forever to ensure the prompt stamping out of life of all the politics that may dare a second experiment in disrupting the United States of America. Had we possessed a huge Union debt in 1860, and had as much of it been diffused among the mountaineers and planters of South Carolina as is now held in Rhode Island, as much in Alabama as now in Indiana, as much in Georgia as now in Minnesota, as much in Virginia as now in Connecticut, the war for slavery had never been waged. While holding the Union bonds, the South would never have made war upon the Union. No practical means could have got at those bonds and taken them out of the South, and sent them here or to Europe to be cashed, so as to have brought the fighting men of the slave states to a willingness to make war on the government on whose perpetuity the payment of the bonds depended. And for the future, there can be no better gage and pledge for the harmonious and co-operative life of the returned Southern States, and for the permanence of the restored Union, than the national diffusion of the national debt. The bond of interest is the bond of concord. We already feel its contracting pressure from Tennessee, Louisiana, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, where the sale of the seven-thirty loan has been established."—p. 10.

We are willing not only to admit the truth of this, but also that it is a valuable truth, one worth millions of dollars. Supposing that the country were about to be dismembered to-morrow, who would not vote to pay hundreds of millions more to unite the different sections together, so that instead of dismemberment the integrity of the republic would be guaranteed for at least another generation? It is because several of the propositions of Mr. Wilkeson are of this character that we have been induced to treat even the grossest of his fallacies with much more lenity than we usually do such things. We also agree with our author that the national debt is a good basis for national banking; and that national banking is a great convenience, if not a substantial service, to the country, few will deny:

"The bonds of the United States, accepted throughout the United States as the highest security, and having a uniform value in every one of

the states, are the only real and safe equivalent for gold and silver, and the only available basis for a uniform banknote currency that shall be money all over the republic. Commerce demands this uniform currency. Politics requires it. The money that is at once current in Massachusetts and Alabama, that has par value in Nebraska and South Carolina, in Virginia and New York, that is taken and passed without scrutiny or suspicion by the advocates of slave labor and the advocates of free labor, by extremists in the South and extremists in the North, by the people of the two seaboards and the people of the Mississippi valley, has the mission to wear down the sectional barriers which the doctrine of states rights and the partisanship of politics have, for three-quarters of a century, been building up into fortified camps of division and civil war. And the uniform national banking currency will perform this misison."

Among the suggestions made by our author, which show that he means well, although rather ambitious in his style as well as illogical in his statements, is that in reference to a revision of our excise system. The following two paragraphs are in the right spirit:

"Revise the excise system itself. Knock the inquisitorial and annoying features out of it. Quit counting the teaspoons of the people. Stop feeling in pockets for watches to tax. Cease this inspection of buggy-wheels and counting of harnesses, and the spectacled peeking into the work and incomes of tailors, shoemakers, and smiths. Quit this counting off on masculine fingers that should be hoeing corn, the bonnets made by milliners, and the manufacture of rainbow wrappage for our dear girls. Quit taxing the matches with which the people light their candles. *A great nation should scorn such sources of revenue.* A free people should be freed *from inquisition into domestic life by salaried officials.* The pride of a nation, its truthfulness, its reasonable right of privacy in conducting its business, should be sacredly shielded by law. Petty sources of income to the United States of America should be flung away. To the utmost possible extent personal annoyance should be avoided in gathering this income.

"The revenues that are collected on the hearthstones and in the barnyards—all those that irritate in the gathering, and, consequently, demoralize, should be scornfully abandoned by us, and that, too, right speedily and forever. DIRECT AND NOT INDIRECT TAXATION SHOULD BE THE ORDER OF THE DAY. The English have no trouble in raising the immense amount of yearly revenue required to carry on their government and to keep down the interest on their debt. They, wiser that we, get it almost wholly out of six articles—spirits, wine, tobacco, sugar, tea, and coffee. After two hundred years of experiment in raising public income, the English have finally set up their principal machinery for its collection in custom houses and distilleries. Let us imitate their proven wisdom."—pp. 16–17.

If our author had reasoned throughout his pamphlet so correctly and sensibly as he has in these two paragraphs, we should not have had a word to say against him. And who will not agree with him that our present arduous revenue system ought to be modified as soon as possible? for it is unworthy of a fifth-rate nation, not to mention the great Republic of the West. We imagine that there is but one class who would object to this, namely, the lazy drones, good for nothing

else, who are engaged as assessors and collectors, and who would not endanger their precious lives if the nation were torn to pieces, whether by foreign or domestic foe.

Another of our author's statements in which we concur is, that "increase of population and increased manufactures will lighten the debt by diffusing it." "Organize emigration," he says; "remove to the United States the cotton manufacture of England—bring here a large part of the silk and muslin manufacture of France—the iron-make and cutlery manufacture of Britain—lift up and bring here a large portion of the mining population of Europe—set it down in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and that farther imperial mineral domain which extends through seventeen degrees of longitude, and sixteen degrees of latitude, and contains an area of more than a million square miles, literally crammed with gold, silver, copper, iron, coal, lead, tin, salt, quicksilver, gypsum, asphaltum, and marble, and which asks only an amount of labor relatively equal to that expended on California, to yield four hundred millions per annum out of two millions alone—gold and silver."

This view of the case is somewhat exaggerated *ex more*. It is not so easy to remove the cotton manufacture of England, the silk and muslin manufacture of France, &c., but it is perfectly true that there would be work for all in the United States for a century to come. This increase of labor would enrich the country much more readily and more certainly than any amount of national debt.

The conclusion of the pamphlet is devoted to the needless task of proving that the "payment of the national debt by subscription is wholly impracticable." As already observed, this was proved in England more than a half century ago, when it would have been much easier to pay the British debt than it would be now to pay the United States debt. There was no harm, however, in making the proposition; and the journalist of the present day had just as good a right to do so as the divine of sixty years ago, even though the former merely wanted to perpetrate a joke while the latter was not more serious in the most elaborate or most pious of his sermons. To this we need only add that, let Mr. Wilkeson blunder as he may, and misrepresent in certain particulars the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Government Agents, however unintentionally, as long as our loans and funding system are so skilfully and honestly managed as they are at present, our debt, large as it is, need be no cause of alarm to the nation.

ART. VII.—1. *The Works of Sir William Jones.* London.

2. *Institutiones Linguæ Persicae cum sanscrita et zendica comparatæ.* J. A. VILLIERS. Giessen. 1840.

3. *Grammatik der lebenden Persischen Sprache.* Leipsick. 1847.

4. *A Grammar of the Persian Language.* By DUNCAN FORBES. London.

IN tracing the history of a nation a double sequence of events must be kept in view, the one logical, the other chronological; the former having for its object to connect the events narrated by the chain of cause and effect, the latter to assign facts to their proper period in time. A history constructed in violation of this principle has no value as a source of instruction, since it is a knowledge of the causes of events, more than of the events themselves, which teaches us what to avoid and what to imitate. The absence of correct chronological sequence entails a confusion which renders a narrative completely worthless, and at the same time seriously impairs logical sequence, since contemporary events often bear the mutual relation of cause and effect, a relation which could not be appreciated apart from a knowledge of the fact that they are contemporary.

Starting with this principle, which lies at the very basis of history, and applying it to the country whose name heads this article, we are stopped *in limine* by a serious lack of both conditions. Notwithstanding the numerous and laborious researches of the archæologists of the last and the present centuries, but comparatively little has been discovered serving to throw light on the ancient history of Persia. True, the untiring zeal and profound scholarship of Sir William Jones, Sir William Ousely, and M. d'Herbelot, have opened the way to discovery, and have developed many interesting points, although none of the latter have been entirely rescued from the mazes of doubt. This appears all the stranger to us on reflecting that Persia occupies a central position in Asia, and that both profane and sacred writings are replete with allusions to the greatness of the early Persian princes. But the reason of this anomaly may be discovered in certain peculiarities of the Persian religion, peculiarities to which we will now merely allude, as we intend dwelling on them at greater length hereafter. If we accept, with M. Cousin, that every age and nation has its

fixed, dominant idea, which influences each existing institution, and gives tone to religion, politics, social economy, literature, science and art, we shall find therein the key to the problem before us. We shall find that the prevailing thought of early Persian times was such precisely as to detract from the importance usually bestowed on the means and conditions of constructing sound history.

In examining the annals of the Persian religion we discover that the earliest form was based on the metaphysical idea of dualism, to wit: that an eternal struggle is going on between the principle of light and the principle of darkness; and that compared to this interminable strife, the wars of princes are but trifles. According to the Zoroasterian idea, Ahriman the principle of darkness and Ormuzd the principle of light are two abstract powers, without shape or visible form, all reaching, ever-existing, though dependent on the supreme god Mithra, and compelled by the nature of things to fight incessantly till victory shall fall to the side of Ormuzd. Having no idea of a deity beyond these twin-conflicting powers, the Persians worshiped no idols—"Neither image, nor temple, nor altar," says Herodotus, "have ever been erected in Persia, and the Persians have no such anthropological views of the divinity as the Greeks."

The effect of this devotion to an idea was to exalt the universal, the invisible, the divine; to regard it, as the only reality; to deem it alone deserving of profound contemplation, and to spurn the merely human as illusory and unreal. We, as men, according to Zoroaster, are but mere phantasmagoria, the only reality being the dual principle which is neither seen, nor felt, nor heard. In consequence of this forced alienation of the human soul from God, and the substitution of a double, universal, thinking substance, which is inappreciable as far as it is real, mere human works sink into insignificance, and a forced subjection to and exaltation of blind necessity become the first duty of man. Hence, we see art vainly endeavoring to reproduce in Persian sculpture and hieroglyphics, this strange conception of the human intellect. We find vast misshapen figures striving to eliminate humanity, and to embody the idea of invisible, necessary power. On the other hand, human events are of dwindled importance, being considered but as the product of unreality. Wars are waged, empires and dynasties pass away, and neither poet nor historian, neither child of Melpomene, nor of Clio, springs up to chant or narrate the valor of kings and heroes.

In this way we venture to account for the striking lack of materials which exists concerning the history and civilization of ancient Persia; but a supplementary reason may be assigned. Though we derive most of our knowledge of Persian antiquities from Greek and Jewish sources, yet the perverse orthography prevalent among writers of both nations has caused a great deal of confusion. Thus we see that Ghustasp, the eleventh king of the Pischdadian line was called Hystaspes by the Greeks; and Lohorasp, a prince of the Caianian dynasty, was called Esdras, by some Jewish writers.

Previous to the time of Sir William Jones it had been customary to look upon the Pischdadian race of kings as the first that ruled in Persia, though it was impossible to settle definitely the precise period of their assumption of the sovereign power. Sir William Jones, during his sojourn in the East, discovered a work written by Moshan Fain, a learned Mahometan, which throws most unexpected light on this difficult question. According to this writer, a powerful monarchy had been established for ages in Iran before the accession of Cayumers, the first of the Pischdadian race; that it was called the Mahabadian dynasty, and that many of its princes had raised their empire to the zenith of human glory. Accepting this account, we are still in doubt to what nation of the East to refer these Mahabadian princes, though the probability is, according to Sir William Jones, that they sprung from a Hindoo stock. This conjecture is strengthened by the striking resemblance we discover between Hindoo pantheism and the dualism of the Persians. Assuming the truth of this opinion, the first Persian line of monarchs must have been the oldest in the world.

The line of kings which succeeded the Mahabadian dynasty is generally known as the Pisdadian, and the records of their reign being chiefly contained in Persian narratives, but little authentic can be learned concerning them. The various Tarikhs or chronicles abound in legendary matter, in which but little truth or even verisimilitude can be discovered, though to the mind of the philosopher such legends are not devoid of deep interest. Thus it is, that in pondering over the strange phantasies of Khondenier, Fordusi, and the various Tarikhs we can obtain glimpses of the civilization of those days; there we find allusions to works of art or science which incidentally reveal the fluctuating progress of mental development at that period. In the earliest dawn of eastern his-

tory we find stories of great cities and stupendous monuments, the size and character of which only partially discovered, fill us with wonderment and curiosity. To-day we find in the plains of Iran the remains of a city, the date of whose foundation is nearly coeval with history itself, and the traveller stands amazed at the colossal ruins which nearly forty centuries have not obliterated. Persepolis, or as it was called among the early Persians, Istakhan, was built under Jemshid, one of the first Pishdadian princes, and though we may not believe all that has been written about it by Persian annalists, yet enough has reached us from authentic sources to render its vast dimensions indubitable. It may, indeed, appear to us incredible that a city, especially in those early times, should take in an area of three hundred and thirty-two miles; yet we must reflect that farms, country-seats, parks and preserves were comprised within this vast enclosure. Moreover, at this period of human history, the minds of men had not been usurped by the contemplation of works less grand than those of nature; and as the mind of the early poet strove to embody ideas gathered from the great book of nature, and not painfully gleaned from human productions, so architects and founders of cities endeavored to imitate the greatness of nature in the monuments and cities which they built.

Throughout the long line of the Pisdadian monarchs, the history of Persian affairs is involved in impenetrable darkness, neither Greek nor Jewish historian having cast the least glimmer of light on the events which then transpired in Persia. Of course Persian chronicles abound in narratives replete with interest to the poet, but of little value to the historian or the student of antiquities. The bards of later times have sung the valor and exploits of the princes and chieftains of those early days, they have flung the charm of poesy over the history of fierce warriors, whose names were a terror to surrounding nations, and they have sung the glories of peaceful princes who fostered the arts among their people, bent their swords into pruning-hooks, and peacefully died, lulled to their last rest by the sighing of the breeze, as it swept over golden-eared fields. But these legendary records give little insight into Persian manners and civilization, and we must come down to a much later period ere we can point to a single fact, the proof of which is placed beyond dispute. The earliest element of Persian civilization that we can discover, as it is the earliest in the history of every nation, is its language, and we will

here offer a few remarks on its structure, development, and peculiarities, as serving to throw light on the stage of intellectual development reached by the Persian at the extinction of the first historical line of Persian princes.

It was not till the establishment of the Caianian dynasty that the ancient language of Persia assumed those characteristics and peculiarities which we recognize in the writings of Zoroaster. These writings, which are chiefly comprised in the *Zeudavesta,* are the only relic of the earliest Persian tongue known as the Zend. Taking the lists of M. Anquetil, we find the most marked resemblance of the Zend language to the Sanscrit, the same fertility in the expression of abstract ideas, the same richness of metaphor, the same suitableness for metaphysical speculation; and, descending to verbal structure, the same sort of termination to the words. This supposition is still further borne out by the suggestion above advanced, that Persia, or Iran, as it was then called, had been ruled by a Hindoo race of kings who may have introduced the Sanscrit language. The Zend language, however, was not the only dialect in use among the Persians of old; indeed it is highly probable that it constituted the liturgical language, and was exclusively employed in the composition of sacred works. This may be inferred both from the recent researches of antiquaries who have made no discovery of the Zend dialect in any profane writing or monument, and from the prevalence in all eastern countries of a sacerdotal language.

The other ancient language of Persia more popularly used, though not claiming such high antiquity, was the Pahlavi, closely cognate to the Chaldaic. This analogy M. Anquetil has satisfactorily established in his Zendavesta, by furnishing a list of similar names from the Pahlavi and the Chaldaic, the differences displaying an admixture of Tartarian in the former. The hypothesis is further strengthened by the considerations, that, according to the nature of the Chaldean tongue, most words ended in the first long vowel like *Shemia, heaven,* and that very word unaltered in a single letter, we find in the Pazend, the commentary on the Zend, together with *lailia, night:* so Zamar, by a beautiful metaphor from *pruning trees,* means in Hebrew to *compose verses,* and thence by an easy transition to *sing* them, and in Pahlavi we see the verb *zamruniten* to *sing,* the verbal termination of the Persian being added to the Chaldaic root. According to some philologists the Arabic predominates in the Pahlavi,

and there is a certain resemblance in the sound of the two languages; but this may be accounted for by the great number of hard consonants used in both.

Admitting the opinion that the Zend and the Pahlavi are offshoots from the Sanscrit and the Chaldaic respectively, we are forced to the conclusion that prior to the times of the Pischdadian dynasty, representatives of the Hindoo and the Hebrew people must have sojourned in the land of Iran. Not only does the resemblance between the dualism of Persia and the pantheism of India seem to indicate this, but the Mosaical account of the rebellion of Lucifer against the Almighty, and the final triumph of divine might, strongly correspond to the Zendean history of Ormuzd and Ahriman, and the triumph of the principle of light.

In addition to these two languages we find a third of more modern date, called Parsi, which sprang into existence a little before the birth of Christ. The present language of the Persians is most nearly allied in form and sound to the old Parsi, and they both seem to bear the same mutual relation as the modern Italian and the Latin. The change induced in the Parsi from its original condition is due to the intermixture of numberless Arabic words, and the infusion of a new spirit, which has rendered the modern Persian tongue the vehicle of the sweetest and most exquisitely polished poetry. The old Parsi is evidently a scion of the Zend, as the multitude of Sanscrit words, wherein it abounds, bears witness.

According to the view taken by Sir William Jones, the Parsi was derived, like the various Indian dialects, from the language of the Brahmins, though this hypothesis seems needless when we might as well refer it, in virtue of its Sanscrit character, to the ancient Zend. In the Parsi language, as well as in the Zend, we perceive a resemblance to the ancient Runic, in which the Saga of the North was written. This resemblance is no doubt due to their common participancy in a Sanscrit termination. Were it not for the admixture of the Sanscrit in most of the eastern languages, antiquaries would have encountered insurmountable obstacles in the prosecution of their researches; but the Sanscrit substratum, on which the various eastern dialects repose, is a sort of *passe-partout* to the most formidable hieroglyphical inscriptions. We find this adaptability of eastern tongues to a Sanscrit interpretation well illustrated, in the renderings of the cuneiform inscriptions, by Major Rawlinson of the British

army, in 1847. These inscriptions, discovered first in Behistim, and afterwards at Persipolis and Hamadan, offer great diversity in their verbal terminations, and a knowledge of Sanscrit alone enabled the learned major to interpret the incongruous readings.

The relation to a common stem disclosed by all the languages of the East, except the Semitic, and the joint agency of the Chaldean and Sanscrit in the formation of those languages, together with the probable original identity of the Sanscrit with the Hebrew before the Captivity, would indicate that, in a modified shape, either Sanscrit or Hebrew had once been the universal language of mankind. At least a knowledge of this mysterious tongue has enabled oriental philologists to harmonize the various dialects of the East, and to trace their growth from a Sanscrit basis to the peculiar formation which the genius of different races infused into them. Turning from the verbal structure of the old Persian tongue, be it Zend or Pahlavi, to its logical and philosophical aspects, we find that it greatly differs from the Parsi, on which the modern Persian is engrafted, by lending itself much more easily to the development of metaphysical problems than to poetical utterance. And this is entirely in keeping with the character of the people using it, for as the sacred and philosophical writings of the old Persians amply attest their fondness for abstruse and subtle speculations, so the gorgeous imagery of Ismat and the exquisite sweetness of Hafiz among the moderns prove how much better suited the Parsi is for poetry.

Apart, therefore, from an examination into the philosophical books of the Persians, the highly cultivated state of their language would argue a degree of thoughtfulness and depth consistent only with an advanced state of civilization. So strikingly powerful, indeed, is the language of the ancient Persians in this respect, that many oriental scholars acknowledge the difficulty of rendering some passages in the Zendavesta into modern European tongues, stating that no periphrasis even will serve to convey the full force of the subtleties contained in that curious production. In this respect the Zend language approximates to the Greek, displaying the same flexibility, the same fertility and power, adapted as well for the events of an epic as for those shaded differences which the mind of the metaphysician can often conceive, though not mould into language. The spirit of the Persian language affords an excellent standard by which to estimate the Per-

sian character and the tone of the Persian mind. Neither in the Pahlavi nor in the Zend do we find a full vocabulary of the names of material things, except such as exist in the rude and unelaborated state, thus showing that neither art nor commerce had brought into requisition the multitude of mechanical implements the names and uses of which have given rise to a great variety of technologies among modern nations. This consists, too, with what history teaches concerning the backward state in which both the fine and the mechanic arts existed during the period of the development of the Pahlavi tongue. On the other hand, we notice that both the Zend and the Pahlavi almost sprang into the maturity of philosophical languages, indicating the proneness of the Persian mind to speculation and the study of abstract themes.

But it is not alone in the barrenness of the Persian tongue in the respect mentioned, nor in the copiousness of its philosophical terms, that we notice the peculiarity alluded to, but in the intimate structure and essence, so to speak, of the language. Thus, the comprehensiveness of the words, which by an admirable system of abbreviation shortens and compounds so as to condense a variety of meanings in the same word, bespeaks the aim and design of its formation to give expression to abstract thoughts and not to material things. It must not be inferred, however, that the Persian language though not well suited for the purposes of commerce and the mechanic arts, is devoid of that richness and abundance which can borrow illustration from the works of nature, and give shape to a subtle thought by a comparison with objects which strike the senses. Indeed, this fertility in the means of illustration, this system of metaphor by which the works of nature are made the exponent of abstract ideas, cannot fail to strike any one who opens a Persian book. The following extract from a poem on the love of Mejnun and Laili will sufficiently prove this:

"The man who had inebriated himself with milk from the nipple of anguish, who had been nourished in the lap of affliction.

"Mejnun, mad with the bright hue and fair face of Laili, himself a dark mole on the cheek of the desert.

"Having found the way to the mansion of love, became fixed like the threshold on the door of love's palace.

"Over his head the form of madness had cast her shadow; the tale of his passion was loudly celebrated."

This method of varied illustration is a necessity with a

language which aims at interpreting abstruse and difficult thoughts.

Having offered these observations on the dialects of early Persia, we will now examine briefly into the state of science and art, as well as the few records handed down from those long past times will allow. It is estimated that the number of mechanical arts now known approaches to three hundred, while the Hindoos counted fifty more and the Persians but very few. Agricultural pursuits for a long time occupied the attention of Persian princes, but no improvements were introduced tending to lighten labor, or to render the soil more yielding of its fruit and seed. Gardening was the species of land-tilling in which taste and ingenuity were displayed, and the spacious terraces around Persepolis, as well as the gardens attached to the residences of the nobles, attest the deep interest taken in the beauties of horticulture. Xenophon makes frequent allusion to those gardens, and describes some of them as possessing features of rare beauty. It is difficult now to determine the precise species of gardening which most pleased the taste of the Persians—whether the figured beds, which must be examined in detail in order to be appreciated, and which, viewed altogether or at a distance, offer no delightful *coup d'œil*, or the landscape gardens of the English, which the eye loves to dwell upon and leisurely contemplate.

As a result of this attention to what may be called the beautiful side of agriculture, a taste for botanical studies grew up among the Persians, and a system of botany, as complex if not as logical as that of Linnæus, was known to exist among them. They were well acquainted with the reputed healing properties of plants, and in their poems we find numberless allusions revealing the widespread use of herbs as healing agents. Indeed, their system of medicine may be said to have consisted solely of lists of medicinal herbs, warranted to cure every disease, from a poisoned bite to a burning fever. In this respect the Persians were far behind the Hindoos, who were acquainted with anatomy, and had a system of medicine purporting to be a revelation from heaven. The Persians, ruled by a doctrine of total dependence on the Deity, strove not to avert by the intervention of art what seemed to be a visitation from God, and hence the means of curing disease was sought only in the simple remedies nature seemed to put into their hands.

Architecture and sculpture go hand in hand, and everywhere partake of common characters. This is especially

noticeable in the architectural and sculptural works of early Persia, and the peculiarities which pervade them are the result, as we before remarked, of the peculiar metaphysical notions concerning the divinity prevalent in Persia. Divesting their Suprem Being of all human attributes, they regarded him as the abstract idea of power and necessity, and consequently strove to eliminate from their representations of him the elements of humanity. Of course, this they could not accomplish entirely, and hence they succeeded only in infusing into their productions the ideas of severity and power, while they excluded the beautiful as merely human. This we see in the sculptured images on the gates of the ruined temples of Persepolis, and in the numismatic collections of the British Museum. The same defect, due, no doubt, to the same cause, is perceptible in their merely human works, as we see by the statue of Darius found in the ruins of Behistim, and of which Diodorus Siculus speaks at great length. The lower part of the rock on which the image has been sculptured is scarped, and Darius is represented holding his bow, with two state officers behind; under his feet lies one rebel, while a line of nine others stand before him, chained one behind the other, with their hands tied. The artist seems to have been engrossed by the desire to make his work typical of great strength and severity, and in this, no doubt, he succeeded, to the utter exclusion of symmetry and proportions, wherein the work is exceedingly lacking.

The dualism of the Zendavesta, as well as the fire-worship of the Sabians, took away from the Persians the means of erecting a standard of human beauty to which their works of art could conform. Humanity was divine as far as real according to Hindoo, Egyptian, and Persian; but it was real only as far as invisible and intangible. Therefore, as far as it was visible and tangible, it was illusory and unreal, and unworthy of our serious contemplation. According to Greek and Roman, divinity was but an exaltation of humanity in its outward form, and it was the attempt to reach the ideal standard of human beauty, as represented by their gods, which inspired the works of Praxiteles and Phidias. We look in vain, therefore, in Persian works of art for the life, beauty, and grace which everywhere start to view as we dwell upon similar works among the Greeks; and we mourn the desolating influence of eastern pantheism, which dwarfed humanity, and chained the powers

of the soul to a malign being, whose baneful rule checked the exercise of every noble faculty. It was not alone in this department of art that the deteriorating influence of this agency was felt, but in every art where the beautiful, as derived from the standard of human beauty, should predominate. Thus, we find that music, the sister of every graceful art, never attained in Persia the degree of perfection which it reached in Greece. Stringed instruments the Persians were but little acquainted with, and for the most part their ears knew but the harsh clanging of cymbals or the loud twang of the horn. Though boasting little knowledge of artistic music, they fully appreciated the moral effect of the simple strains to which they were accustomed to listen, and their poet-philosophers often speak of the soothing influence of music, making it the object-term of most beautiful comparisons. They compare the soft strains of music to a gently welling spring which rises and bathes the dry and weary limbs of those who seek its refreshing influences, or to the rushing of the divine spirit as it overshadows the soul and fills it with its own serenity.

Leaving, then, Persian art as something hopelessly oppressed by Persian theology, let us see what progress they made in science. Of science among the early Persians we know but little, since Greek historians, through ignorance or jealousy, have given us but very meagre information, and the accounts contained in Persian Tarikhs are very unreliable, if not entirely fabulous. Khondemir, the Froissart of Ancient Persia, relates that, during the reign of Caikaus, son and successor of Caicobad, the first monarch of the Caianian dynasty, two astronomical observatories were erected in Iran, one near the river Euphrates, and another near the Tigris, not far from the present site of Bagdad. Thither resorted all the learned men of the East, and many important astronomical discoveries were made, though in the Tarikh recitals, they assume the characters of astrology. This first account of the study of astronomy dates back to the twilight period where history begins to emerge from fable, and is a proof with what unremitting ardor the study of this sublime science was pursued among the Persians. No sage would presume to bear the name who could not trace the course of the planets in the heavens, and predict human events by the movement of the stars. From its birth astronomy was hampered by the false science of astrology, and modern writers are prone to accord no credit to the genuine

astronomical knowledge of the ancients, but to sneer at the pretensions of astrology. We doubt not that, had the ruthless Mussulman not destroyed every vestige of early Persian literature, many would entertain a higher opinion of the character of Persian astronomy than they now do, and would regard astrology as a fungus that had fastened on a healthy trunk. At any rate, there is no period in Persian history during which we are not informed of the works and studies of astronomers, and no doubt it was this ardent devotion to astronomcial science which finally led to Sabianism or worship of the heavenly hosts.

The same love of the mysterious which led to the nightly contemplation of the heavens induced many Persians to explore the secrets of the mineral kingdom, and chemistry and alchemy sprang into existence. Dr. Hyde vindicates for the Persians the title of successful chemists;* and certain it is that the neighboring nations borrowed from the Persians what knowledge they possessed of the physical and chemica. properties of mineral substances. The kindred delusions of alchemy and astrology, however, prevented a full and open study and discussion of the sciences to which they respectively clung. So we have no enunciation of the fundamental principles of those sciences. Not so, however, in natural philosophy, or physics. Here there was no personal interest to be subserved by secrecy, so every discovery was freely revealed, and every law or principle loudly proclaimed. One extract from a work of the Sufis, or wise men of Persia, will serve to show how rational was the method they pursued, and how nearly they approached the law of universal gravitation, the discovery of which constitutes Newton's greatest title to glory. "There is a strong propensity which dances through every atom and attracts the minutest particle to some particular object; search this universe from its base to its summit, from fire to air, from water to earth, from all below the moon to all above the celestial spheres, and thou wilt not find a corpuscle destitute of that natural attractibility. The very point of the first thread in this apparently tangled skein is no other than such a principle of attraction, and all principles besides, are void of real basis. From such a propensity arises every motion perceived in heavenly or in terrestrial bodies. It is a disposition to be attracted which taught hard steel to rush from

* De Relig. Vet. Pers.

its place, and rivet itself on the magnet; it is the same disposition which impels the light straw to attach itself firmly on amber; it is this quality which gives every substance in nature a tendency towards another, and an inclination forcibly directed to a determinate point." The same doctrine is contained in the Vedas of the Hindoos, and surely we cannot but be struck by the wonderful resemblance between these views and one of the grandest discoveries of modern times.

Owing to the total destruction of Persian literature at the time of the Mahomedan subjugation, we have lost nearly all old Persian records, and as the Greeks have given us no information touching the state of the natural science among them we must only infer from the little which has reached us that many valuable discoveries were made by a people who devoted themselves so assiduously to the study of nature. It is hard to account for the complete silence of Greek historians on this subject, unless we suppose that jealousy prevented them from giving credit to their enemies for an advancement in those arts which constituted their chief boast and glory. This seems the more strange when we reflect that Xenophon has furnished us with a highly elaborate and finished account of the mode of administration of the Persian empire, and the management of Persian affairs, at the time of Cyrus, a period whereat we would naturally expect the Persians had reached the highest degree of perfection in the various arts wherein they excelled. We know that Cyrus was the great patron of the arts, and strove to shape the tastes of his people to a love of agriculture and commerce, arts which involved the knowledge and cultivation of the physical sciences. We know that by mechanical appliances he had overcome obstacles to the victorious progress of his arms, which neither valor nor numbers ever could have surmounted; yet Xenophon, in his detailed account of the life of Cyrus, alludes to none of those things. Instead, however, of such information, he has given us the earliest Grecian account of the Persian empire, and has thrown a steady light on the history of Persia's greatest king.

Xenophon is the chief historian of Cyrus, though his Cyropædia is more intended as a reflex of the virtues and personal endowments of that great man than as a history of his wars and exploits. The latter are related at more length by Persian writers. How much fiction Xenophon may have interwoven with the truth in his Cyropædia it is hard to

determine, though we find numerous discrepancies between his narrative and the accounts handed down by Persian historians; and Cicero says it was written, "*non ad historiæ fidem sed ad effigiem justi imperii.*" However, since it is our aim to use it merely for the purpose of discovering the state of internal affairs in Persia, and not to follow step by step the education of Cyrus, we may consider it as possessed of sufficient historical value. We could wish for no better clue to the social status and the grade of civilization of a people than that afforded by the character of the education established among them. By applying this test to the Persians, we shall be easily able to discover in their system of education those elements of greatness which raised the Persian empire under Cyrus to the zenith of its glory. The training of all young men, who could afford to pay the stipulated sum, was entrusted to the state; and from the moment the articles were signed by which they were guaranteed a state education they ceased to become members of their respective families, but at once were made children of the nation. We perceive in this disposition a strong resemblance to the law of Lycurgus regulating the education of youth. All the young men thus adopted by the state were assembled in the Agora or city forum. This agora was divided into four departments, one for the boys, one for the youth, one for the full-grown men, and one for those who were beyond the years of military service. Over each of the classes were appointed twelve presidents, each representing one of the twelve classes into which the Persian population had been distributed. The presidents appointed over the boys were chosen from among the elders; those over the youth, from among the full-grown men; and over the full-grown men and the elders, such of their own number as were considered best qualified to teach those under them to perform their appointed duties in the best possible manner. The boys attended the public schools, where they learned the principles of literature, history, and philosophy; they also attended the courts of justice, and by closely studying the decisions of the judges early learned the principles of justice. Their superiors taught them to shun vice, and especially ingratitude, as this crime was regarded among them with extreme abhorrence. The necessity of telling the truth under all circumstances, was also strongly impressed on them from a tender age, so that a Persian of that time who was not thoroughly degraded would blush to be called a liar. They were taught

temperance in their diet, so that those who could afford to procure the richest delicacies felt a pride in sharing the coarse food of their humbler companions. When the boys reached their sixteenth year, they were admitted into the division of the young men, among whom the next ten years were spent. The young men guarded the city by night, and kept themselves at the disposal of their superiors by day. They constantly exercised themselves in games and all athletic sports calculated to develop their physique and increase their powers of endurance.

For this purpose they went to the hunt scantily provided, depending rather on what the fortunes of the day would furnish them than on any regular supplies. In this way the Persians learned that endurance of cold, hunger, and thirst, that dogged resolution and invincible patience, which made them masters of Central Asia, and almost able to cope with the skill and bravery of the Greeks. The middle-aged men continued the pursuits of war, but during leisure time devoted themselves to the study of the institutions they might be soon called upon to direct. The principal virtue the Persians of those times valued was justice, and so strictly in accordance with the principles of equity were all the decisions rendered that there was no appeal among them. Every one was disposed to abide by the verdict of the courts, and judicial corruption was unknown The elders, or those beyond fifty, were exempt from military service, and devoted their lives to the interests of their country in whatever way their counsel and experience might aid her. "Such," writes Xenophon, "is the form of government among the Persians, and such the care bestowed upon it, by the observance of which they think that they become the best citizens." So much did this system gain favor among the Greeks that Aristotle recommends every city to have an Agora, or forum, free from buyers and sellers, and devoted to the education of citizens.

Though Xenophon has furnished detailed accounts of the system of education pursued among the Persians at the time of Cyrus, he has left but little information concerning the state of literature, philosophy, and science. Being a Greek, and accustomed to consider his countrymen the most warlike people in the world, it is but natural that he should speak slightingly of the Persians in that respect, though he considered them far superior to all the nations of the East. They were skilled in the use of the bow and javelin, and

rarely broke before an attack conducted in accordance with the system of tactics in vogue among themselves; but they had no power to adapt themselves to circumstances, and once their line of battle was broken they never could recover. For this reason they never gained a victory over the Grecks, who knew the unwieldiness of the Persians, and always threw them into confusion from the first onset. Notwithstanding the opinion of Sir William Jones in regard to the identity of Cai-Khosru with Cyrus the Great, yet we cannot but be struck with the wonderful discrepancies we discover between the recital of Greek and Persian historians, and the different attributes ascribed to both princes. The Persian poet, Firdusi, is more in accord with the Grecian writers than are any of the chronicles. We must, therefore, only acknowledge the obscurity of the subject, and wait for new light.

According to the Persian writers, the successor of Cai-Khosru was Lohorasp, under whose reign many remarkable events occurred. It was he who first introduced the system of military discipline and public education, the credit of which is given by the Greek historians to Cyrus. He obliterated the distinctions of rank among the nobles, and manifested great simplicity in his life and manners. He devoted himself with extraordinary zeal to military enterprises, and it was under his reign that the Persians, led by Raham, surnamed Bakhtalnassar, called by the Hebrews Nebuchadnessar, and by the Greeks Nabuchodonosor, sacked and utterly demolished the city of Jerusalem. We can more nearly approach to a correct date of the reign of this prince by the extended history the Jewish books give of the exploits of Bakhtalnassar, though no mention is made of the prince himself, who resided in the extreme east of his empire. Kischtasb, the son of Lohorasp, was the first Persian prince who fled for succor to the Greeks, by whom he was called.

The military genius of Cyrus had infused a martial ardor into the masses of the Persian people, had spread the fame and terror of the Persian name far and wide, and had extended the boundaries of the Persian empire to the East as far as the Erythræn sea, to the north as far as the Euxine, to the west as far as Cyprus and Egypt, and to the south as far as Ethiopia; notwithstanding he fostered the arts and sciences, and carefully excluded all enervating influences from his country, no sooner did he die than all that was great and good perished with him. Love of truth was succeeded by shameless mendacity; integrity by corruption;

temperance by the wildest excesses; all that was pure, frugal, and pleasing to the gods, by lust, prodigality, and impiety. Those who formerly were satisfied with one spare meal a day now spent the whole day in banqueting, delighting to eat and drink to excess. Formerly the middle-aged men and the youth went frequently to the chase for the purpose of exercising themselves and their horses. "But," says Xenophon, "since King Artaxerxes and his courtiers have yielded to the influence of wine, they have neither gone out so frequently themselves nor have sent out others to the chase; and if some, from a fondness for exercise, have gone out hunting with their horsemen about them, the other Persians have manifestly envied them, and hated them for presuming to seem superior to themselves."

Thus luxury and idleness brought not only internal ruin on the Persians, but their complete neglect of military affairs left them at the mercy of those who saw fit to attack them. "It was customary in past times," writes Xenophon, "that those who possessed lands should furnish horsemen from them for the army, and that the soldiers in garrison, if it should be nccessary to take the field, should fight as paid troops in defence of their country; but now the great men enroll porters, bakers, cooks, cup-bearers, bathers, men who set dishes on the table and remove them, men who assist people to bed and to get up, dressers who anoint people, paint their faces, and trick them out in other ways, and all such characters do they enroll in the cavalry to serve instead of themselves." The scythe-bearing chariots, which had proved so formidable in the armies of Cyrus, were now a cause of frequent discomfiture, owing to mismanagement and the appointment of incompetent charioteers. We discover in the decline of the Persian empire, immediately after the time of Cyrus, another proof of the melancholy truth history has so often attested, that where the genius of a great prince expends itself in territorial conquest, where the patriotism and virtue of a people are founded on a passion for glory, ruin and desolation are in store for them. The fall of the Roman empire proves this so indubitably that a mere allusion to the fact is sufficient. Greece has proved it in her history of federated states, in her grasping ambition to extend her rule over barbarian nations. India has proved it in her early history, and to-day the Chinese empire is a living proof of the same truth. Though the untiring efforts and splendid talents of one man may for a time hold together the unstable and un-

wieldy mass, it will be sure to bury less competent successors in the crash of its own ruin. Thus Persia, not content with home institutions unsurpassed among eastern nations, but expanding herself in every direction, sank beneath her own weight. Moreover, the constant intercourse of the Persians with the Greeks, by teaching the former their own inferiority, inflamed their envy, and then commenced a series of wars which extended over a period of several years, ended in the complete overthrow of the Persian arms and the subjugation of that country by Alexander the Great. The princes who succeeded Bahman, or Artaxerxes Longimanus, distinguished their reigns in no respect till we come to Darab, or Darius, the reputed father of Alexander, whose wars and achievements form the staple of all Grecian histories of that period.

From the dawn of Persian history, and long prior to the time of Zoroaster, the Magi had possessed this system, and we must, therefore, regard them as the creators of philosophy among the Persians. The great diversity of opinions concerning the state of the first appearance of magianism in Iran proves the very great antiquity of this system, and the analogy which all subsequent systems bear to it establishes it as the source of Persian philosophy. Indeed, the peculiar dogmas of the magi are so intermingled with the doctrines of the Zendavesta and the Sabian rites, like a river whose waters are stained with the flow of many tributaries, that we can with difficulty distinguish the genuine faith from the various accessions which time has lent it. But the influence of the magi on the character and morals of the old Persians is undoubted, nor has the lapse of time utterly destroyed the vestiges of their power. They constituted a distinct class in the community, residing in villages apart from those of a different caste,* and were held in the highest esteem by their followers. They were philosophers, intimately acquainted with every system past and contemporary; they were politicians, and carefully superintended the management of public affairs; they eschewed violence as a means of converting men to their views, and won them over by the force of reason; they ruled by knowledge; the wise they ruled by wisdom, the weaker ones by the terrible secrets of nature, which always impose the law upon ignorance; they adapted themselves to every variety of circumstances in which they could be placed; and came nearest to the fulfilment of St. Paul's admonition to

* *Vide* Clement. Alexand. Stromat., l. viii, p. 632.

his followers, to be "all things to all men." The fundamental tenet of the magian religion was dualism, or the existence of two antagonistic principles, which shared the rule of the universe—one the principle of light, the other the principle of darkness. As a result, fire, the symbol of light, became among them the first object of worship, and the principal function of the magi was to propagate this worship and attend to the preservation of the sacred fire. For this purpose they were divided into three classes: the simple magi, on whom devolved the care of the temples, and all things thereunto belonging; the teachers, who instructed the people in the mysteries and dogmas of their religion; and the archi-magi, who regulated the affairs of state, and gave the benefit of their wisdom and experience to all who sought their counsel.* The magi were always averse to idolatry in every shape, and especially prohibited the worship of images; and so careful were they lest the people should fall into this vice that for a long time no altar or temple was erected by them. At last, when the whole land had become imbued with their doctrines, and they found it necessary to set apart special abodes for the preservation of the sacred fire, they selected rocks and caverns—temples built by nature.† These temples were of a three-fold sort: either simple rocks, like the wayside oratorios of some countries, in which the sacred fire burned in a lamp on altars hewn from the solid rock, where the fire was kept in larger quantities: or, finally, huge pyres, as they were called—vast rock edifices without shape or proportion—and which, in point of dignity, Prideaux tells us, ranked with modern cathedrals or metropolitan churches. It is easy to perceive, from the manifold interests in which the magi took a share, how wide must have been their influence, and how great the honor attaching to the character of a magus. Hence kings and nobles aspired to the character, and Darius often referred with pride to his position of archi-magus. The dogmatic theology of the magi is very close akin to the philosophy of Zoroaster, and the system of fire-worship is therefore far more ancient than is generally supposed.‡

Any attempt to give a synopsis of the magian system would be fruitless, since most accounts confound it with the system of Zoroaster. Thus, Aristotle, Hermippus, Eudoxus,

---

* *Vide* Hyde, c. 8, 29. † Prideaux, p. 223.

‡ Strabo, lib. xv.

Theopompus,* and Plutarch, though giving lengthy developments on the religion of the magi, invariably treat us to the philosophic figments of Zoroaster. Abulfeda, an Arabian writer,† gives a far clearer though more succinct account of Magianism. He says that the ancient religion of the Persian magi was based on the veneration of light as the principle of goodness, and the avoidance of darkness as the principle of evil; that our body, weighing us down to the gross pleasures of earth, inclines us to darkness, but our soul, the seat of intelligence, tends upwards and to the light; that our unhappiness proceeds from this antagonism within ourselves, which will not cease till dissolution has taken place; and, as our deserts may determine, we shall find eternal peace in the bosom of light, or grope for ever in Cimmerian darkness. We here miss the emanations of Zoroaster, which were evidently borrowed from the Hindoos, and are led to infer that at this period the system of Persian religion was altogether indigenous, and in no way indebted to the Hebrews or the Hindoos. Moreover, we see no mention made of Mizra, or the supreme principle on which, according to Zoroaster, the secondary principles of light and darkness are dependent. Hyde, however, is of opinion that the magi believed in the supremacy of one God, but that through excessive reverence for his name they omitted the mention of it in their writings. Here, as in other things, Hyde has shown himself the warm champion of the Persians, and often the charge has been preferred against him that he attached more weight to the sacred writings of the ancient Persians than to the utterances of the Holy Scripture. Notwithstanding that many volumes have been written on the religion of the magi, little can be learned of those points in which it differed from the system of Zoroaster.

Many historians maintain that the philosophy of Zoroaster was not simple dualism like the Manicheism of some early Christians, but that he admitted one supreme deity, called Mithra, the source and principle of all existing things. This opinion is based on some obscure references in the Zendavesta to the Great Mithra, who controls the struggles of Ahriman and Ormuzd, and has determined the day which will bring victory to the latter. Beausobre‡ and Hyde, on this ground, claim for the follow-

* Laert, lib. i. sec. 8. † *Vide* Pocock, Specim. Histor. Arab., p. 146.
‡ Beausobre, chap. xx., p. 161.

ers of Zeratusht a purer form of worship than is generally accorded by those who look upon them as mere fire-worshippers. Granting the greater probability that Ahriman and Ormuzd were the subordinate agents of the great Mithra, and that their struggle was carried on in conformity with his designs, yet these were the every-day deities at whose shrines the people paid devotion; there they respectively feared and loved and strove to win their favor.

Although the Zendavesta has formed the subject of various commentaries, few are of accord in their views of the tendency and nature of the doctrines contained in it, Hyde, Bayle, and Prideaux insisting on discordant opinions. This disagreement arises from the numerous Arabic interpolations, which render it difficult to distinguish the genuine text from what is spurious, and the difficulty is increased on account of the many Zoroasters who have lived at widely different epochs. Indeed, so obscure is the question of the identity of the author of Zendavesta that Greek, Mahometan, and Jewish writers differ in the most unaccountable way. Eutychius* and Abulpharaius† make him coeval with Cambyses, though Brucker,‡ together with Pocock, considers that he flourished at a period long prior to the time of Cyrus; and this opinion is strengthened by the discovery of a sacred Persian book entitled Ladder, which bears the mark of extreme antiquity in its style, and which thus speaks of the Zendavesta. We give Hyde's translation into Latin verse:

"Zeratusht attulit religionem rectam
Nemo debet in hac religione esse remissus
Quia Deus ei dedit Vestva-zend
Unde religio ejus in mundo celsa evasit."

But passing over this unsatisfactory question we will give a few propositions from the Zendavesta, divested of the allegorical drapery in which Zoroaster has clothed his doctrines, and thus we will be able to form a more distinct idea of the moral and metaphysical bearing of the Zendean philosophy:

"I. From nothing nothing comes.

"II. Therefore from all eternity a certain infinite principle has existed from whose bosom all existing things have sprung.

"III. Since the emanation supposes the utmost life and power in its source, and since we can conceive nothing more perfect in those respects than fire, therefore fire is the eternal principle from which all things have emanated.

---

* Annal. Alexandrin., T. i., p. 263. † Dynast. v.

‡ Bruckeri Historia Critica Philosophia, T. i., lib. ii., cap. iii., De Philosophia Persarum, p. 146.

"IV. Whereas, there exists an irreconcilable diversity between spiritual and material natures, the two first emanations from fire, the one spiritual, the other material, must be arrayed against each other in ceaseless strife, a strife which is typified in the struggle between Ahriman and Ormuzd.

"V. Since spiritual natures, in virtue of their greater perfection, are nearer to the source of their emanation, they partake more of the characteristics of that source, and hence the greater mobility and subtility of spirits.

"VI. Matter has emanated at the greatest distance from its source, and consequently is dark and inert.

"VII. This inertness is the result of the manner of emanation, and not intrinsic to the substance evolved.

"VIII. Therefore the imperfections of matter did not proceed from God, but are the accidental conditions of its mode of evolution."

We here find some important propositions as disclosing the acquaintance Zoroaster has had with the writings of the Jews and the Hindoos. The monotheistic principle on which this system rests is evidently borrowed from Moses, while the notion of emanation savors of the pantheism of the Hindoos, though it is much more philosophical than the crude idea of self-multiplication held by the latter. Indeed, nothing could be more ingenious than the way in which the Supreme Deity is vindicated from the charge of imperfection, by referring the evils which exist in the world to the mode and not to the principle of emanation. This difficulty the Manicheans felt acutely, and though Bayle in taking their part exhausted his ingenuity to explain the apparent incongruity of good and evil in the world, he suggested no explanation half so simple and philosophical as that of Zoroaster. Besides the Zendavesta, Zoroaster has left other writings, the authenticity of which, however, is not beyond dispute, since they contain doctrines and ideas utterly at variance with those advanced in the Zendavesta. The concurrent opinion of most scholars attribute them to Zoroaster, and so we always find them presented under his authorship. The most celebrated of his works, next to the Zendavesta, is entitled "The Oracles," and we depend on what Plato tells us for the nature of its contents. The principle is polytheistic, with the avowed supremacy of Ζευς, or Jupiter, though we do not know what changes the followers of Plato may have introduced into the work.

The λογια were esteemed among the Greeks as containing the most precious relics of oriental philosophy,* and the portion which has come to us from the Platonists is accom-

* Clement. Alexandr. Str. l. i., p. 304. Fabricius, p. 247. Beausobre, p. 314, *et seq.*

panied by innumerable commentaries. The fullest edition of the Oracles was edited by Francis Patricius, containing the commentaries of Hermias Olympiodorus, Synesius, Simplicius Damascus, and Nicephorus, blemished, however, by several inaccuracies and interpolations. The difficulty of stating the substance of the doctrines contained in the Oracles is enhanced by the highly allegorical manner in which they are presented, closely resembling, in this respect, the tenets of the Gnostics of early Christianity. The metaphysics of the Oracles are nearly the same as those of the Bhagavod-Gita of the Hindoos, and proclaim the identity of all things with the principle whence they emanated. According to Cudworth,* the Alexandrians, or neo-Platonists, borrowed their *Triad* from the "Oracles," where we find the following proposition: "Unity begot duality, which duality resides constantly with unity, and all three, enthroned in inaccessible light, illumine and direct the world." Some of the early defamers of Christianity asserted that the Christian notion of the Trinity was derived from the same source. Instead of attempting to drag down the sublime truths of Christianity to the level of the mystical dogmas contained in the writings of Zoroaster, the Fathers of the Church perceived in these latter, a twilight tradition of the great truths revealed at the creation, but which were gradually perverted by the vagaries of the human mind. This appears the more probable, for the reason that as we advance in the history of Persian religion and philosophy, we lose sight of those truths, and soon find ourselves immersed in gross idolatry. Thus Strabo† says, that in addition to Ahriman and Ormuzd, the Persians worshipped Aman, Anandrate, and Anaitis, and erected fire temples to the sun. Nor did they stop here, for Herodotus‡ tells us that they worshipped water, in which assertion Strabo and Agathias concur. According to Xenophon§ they worshipped the earth, and Strabo‖ goes so far as to say that they paid divine honors to the sun, the moon, water, fire, air, and earth. Thus, together with other eastern nations, they continued to plunge deeper and deeper into the mire of idolatry, till finally their excesses elected the well-known sarcasm of Juvenal:

"O sanctæ gentes quorum morsu cepe frangere nefas."

After the purity of the Zendean religion had been once

* System. Intellect. l. i., ch. 4, p. 134. †L. ch. ii. ‡ Lib. i. § Cyropæd, lib. i. ‖ Lib. xv.

tarnished by foreign admixtures and corruptions, it continued to change rapidly till the first well-defined system which grew out of it, was styled Sabianism, or planet-worship. The origin of this word is obscure, but it has been deduced by grammarians from the word Saba, a host, and particularly the host of heaven, or the celestial bodies, and it is easy to perceive that this system of worship among the Persians was the direct result of the exalted virtues Zoroaster ascribed to the sources of light and heat.

Next to Zoroaster no ancient philosopher enjoyed greater celebrity than Hostanes, the period of whose existence is, however, involved in considerable doubt. Pliny makes him coevil with Zoroaster ;* but the more probable opinion is that he lived many years after, which Suidas† and Diogenes Laertius‡ have almost proved. We have no record of his philosophical doctrine beyond a few mystical allusions contained in the works of some early Christian writers among whom we will mention Tatian, Tertullian,§ and St. Augustine.‖ Suidas makes him the author of astronomy among the Persians,¶ and Hyde informs us that he wrote a work on chemistry which disclosed and advanced knowledge of that science. Notwithstanding we thus find his name frequently mentioned among Greek and Latin authors, but little really authentic is known concerning him, Scalier and Bochart having disproved the story of his travels and sojourn among the Egyptians. Indeed, it seems that the writings of Zoroaster alone are to be taken as the representative work of Persian philosophy, for these alone have stood the test of close criticism. Moreover, what has been handed down to us concerning the ancient magi and the fire-worshippers has come through indirect channels, or is contained in the works of modern Persian writers whose authority is not deemed unimpeachable. Thus, in respect to the magi, many hold disputes about the meaning of the word, and there is a doubt whether their origin is to be referred to a period prior or posterior to the time of Zoroaster. We have said that the philosophical tenets of the Zendavesta are draped in allegory and tinged with that mysticism which is characteristic of the Eastern mind.

---

* *Plin.* lxxx., c. 1. † *Vide* t. ii., p. 723. ‡ *Vide* lib. 1, Sec. 2. § *Deanima*, cap. 57. ‖ *Contra Donotist*, lvi., cap. 44.

¶ *Vide. Astronom.*, tom. c, p. 360, where Suidas says that he was the first to predict the destinies of men from the movements of the heavenly bodies, and that the Greeks and Egyptians borrowed the art from the Persians.

Among the Persians philosophy and poetry gradually blend together, and in reading their works we are at a loss which most to admire, the abstruse metaphysical speculations or the vein of grand devotional poetry. The Sufis, or modern Persian philosophers, are the guardians of these philosopho-poetical conceptions of Zoroaster and opening the Dabistan, which contains the subtle system of Persian metaphysics, we find numerous reflections suggested by the doctrines and principles of Zoroaster. We are told that the chief happiness of mankind in this transitory world consists in as perfect a union with the Eternal Spirit as the incumbrances of a mortal frame will allow; that for this purpose men should break all connection with extrinsic objects, and pass through life without attachments, as a swimmer in the ocean strikes out freely without the impediment of clothes; that they should be straight and free as the cypress, whose fruit is hardly perceptible, and not sink under a load like fruit-trees attached to a trellis; that, if mere earthly charms have power to influence the soul, the idea of celestial beauty must overwhelm it in ecstatic delight; that for want of apt words to express the divine perfections and the ardor of devotion we must borrow such expressions as approach the nearest to our ideas, and speak of beauty and love in a transcendent and mystical sense; that, like a reed torn from its native bank, like wax separated from delicious honey, the soul of man bewails its disunion with the Godhead in strains of melancholy music, and sheds burning tears like the lighted taper waiting passionately for the moment of its extinction as a disengagement from earthly trammels and the means of returning to its only beloved. Such are a few ideas and expressions taken from the philosophy of the Persians, and we cannot fail to be struck by the sense of tender devotion which pervades them—akin to the exquisite piety of Thomas à Kempis—as well as by the mystic quietism which reminds one of Molinos. Mysticism is the main feature of Persian poetry, and we cannot take up a volume of ancient or modern date without being strongly impressed with the mystical and transcendental flights of the poet's fancy, constantly ranging amid the upper clouds, and laboring to express something not clearly or satisfactorily conceived. The grand idea of one God, and of our intimate union with him, whereby we are identical with him, being emanations of his essence, led the poet philosophers of Persia to grasp at ideas too vast for comprehension, and hence the shadowy vagueness which

georgeous allegory has striven to clothe. Hafiz has embodied in his poems many of the mystical ideas held traditionary among the Persians, and though he lived after the time of Mahomet, we may take him as the echo of many ages gone before. A few detached passages will afford a slight knowledge of the mystical poetry of the Persians.

"In eternity without beginning, a ray of thy beauty began to gleam; when love sprang into being, and cast flames over all nature.

"On that day thy cheek sparkled even under thy veil, and all this beautiful imagery appeared on the mirror of our fancies.

"Rise, my soul, that I may pour thee forth on the pencil of that supreme artist who comprised in a turn of his compass all this wonderful scenery!

"Where are the glad tidings of union with thee; that I may abandon all desire of life? I am a bird of holiness, and would fain escape from the net of this world.

"The sum of our transactions in this universe is nothing; bring us the wine of devotion, for the possessions of this world vanish.

"O, the bliss of that day when I shall depart from this desolate mansion; shall seek rest for my soul, and shall follow the braces of my beloved.

"Dancing with love of his beauty like a mote in a sunbeam, till I reach the spring and fountain of light whence yon sun derives all his lustre."

The object of this ode is evidently the Supreme Deity, and the language is highly fitting and reverential but often when the poet gives free rein to his Pegasus he employs expressions almost licentious, and gives utterance to sentiments bordering on wild voluptuousness.

But in this we must only behold the passionate fervor of devotion, the burning effusions of a soul seeking after its source, as the human lover sighs and anguishes for the object of his affections, and in this way we may rank the mystical hymns of the Persians with the Canticle of Canticles in the Bible. "We profess eager desire," says the poet Maulavi, "but with no carnal affection, and circulate the cup, but no material goblet, since all things are spiritual among us, and all is mystery within mystery." In the later poets of Persia, therefore, even those who lived since Mahometanism overshadowed the land, we find the principles of Zendavesta and the works of the Magi constantly germinating and giving fruit.

Of the ancient poets of Persia but little is known, as there is but little known of ancient Persian literature, generally; all that has been handed down being very much garbled and not deserving of great credit. The Greeks were for a long time the sole depositaries of early Persian literature, and it is feared that the hatred which many years of war with the

Persian monarchs had begotten in their hearts did not inspire them with a strong interest in the treasures which they guarded. Hence we must look in the writings of Plato and the philosophers of the Alexandrian school for evidences of the character and style of many Persian writers, and must expect the bias of national antipathy to characterize their views and opinions. Of Persian writers there is but one who has had access to authentic sources of ancient Persian literature and lore, and that is the poet Firdousi, who possessed a few original annals in the Pahlavi language, which escaped the general destruction of Persian books when the Mussulmans invaded and conquered Iran. Firdousi lived in the eleventh century of the Christian era, and the four hundredth year of the Hegira, and composed a heroic poem entitled Shah Nameh, which contains the record of the Persian kings from Cainmaras to Yezdegerd, interspersed with astonishing fiction and delightful romance. In this work Firdousi follows the unsettled chronology of other Persian writers, but he relates battles, adventures, and the fortunes of kings and princes in a style as extravagant andpoetic as we admire in the Orlando Furioso. This work contains sixty thousand destichs, and owing to the genuineness of the sources from which the materials of the history embodied in it were taken, it is regarded as useful as a chronicle as it is pleasing to the imagination as a poem. Besides Firdousi the poet, Nizami has written a work entitled "The Five Treasures of Nizami," which affords some curious information, interwoven with much romance and fiction. He gives a long history of Alexander the Great, in which the incidents of that monarch's reign assume a character altogether different from that given to them by Greek historians. We see, therefore, that few monuments of ancient Persian letters have reached us; and there exists no means of exactly determining the literary status of that people at the most interesting period of their history. But the zeal of recent antiquaries promises much that will be highly instructive and replete with interest when their labors will have been accomplished.

ART. VIII.—*Annual Catalogues of various Universities, Colleges, Seminaries, &c., &c.*, 1865.

OUR pile of catalogues is much smaller than it was this time last year; we find the number diminishing every year in proportion as we criticise. It is but just to say, however,

that there are exceptions. There are a few who take our criticisms in good part, and do not feel above adopting such suggestions as they think useful or judicious. We need hardly add that they are the best educators who are most willing to rectify any error they may have fallen into, and the most ready to check any vitiated habit, whether they happen to observe it themselves, or whether it is pointed out to them by others.

This reminds us rather forcibly of our friends the book publishers; for as long as they entertained the notion that we like others, would praise their publications indiscriminately, always declaring the last superior to all that had gone before it, they almost overwhelmed us with packages. We do not in the least exaggerate when we say that there was a time, not long since, when we used to receive from sixty to one hundred volumes a week, including whole sets of voluminous works. But the effect of a little criticism in diminishing the size of these bundles was really wonderful, especially when it was found that the most liberal advertising patronage did not secure them immunity at the hands of our critic, or open his eyes to their transcendent merits. We need hardly inform our readers that it is those who publish the worst books that have been the first to take umbrage at our venturing to find fault with them; just in proportion as the books were bad or indifferent, did they exhibit a falling off on our table; or what amounts to the same, in proportion as the books were good they were continued, and in the same proportion they are continued to the present day. It is exactly the same with the catalogues of universities, colleges, seminaries, &c. We cannot, indeed, purchase such of the latter as we want to examine when they are not forwarded to us in the usual way, as we cheerfully do those of the former, for the reason that catalogues are rather inventories of merchandise than the thing itself. Yet we seldom fail to secure a copy of any catalogue we want without leaving our study in pursuit of it, so that those who try to evade criticism in this way, and conceal their charlatanism, are scarcely less thoughtless than the ostrich that fancies she protects her whole body by thrusting her head into the sand.

But it is neither our business nor our intention to be unfriendly either to publishers or professors; and need we say that we entertain no such feeling? On the contrary, there are no two classes whom we respect or esteem more; nor do we think that there are any who have stronger

claims on *public* respect and esteem, when they are qualified for their position, and disposed to acquit themselves of its duties. It is against those who are neither one nor the other that we make war. If the judge passes sentence on certain members of any class whatever, it does not follow that he is the enemy of that class; it is much more correct to consider him as its friend, provided his judgment is founded on sufficient proof of their guilt. Supposing this guilt to consist in seeking to pass off brass for gold, or a counterfeit bank-bill for the genuine, who would say that the party proved to have incurred it did not deserve to be exposed and punished? And the truth is that one who pretends to teach others what he does not understand himself, and charges them money for doing so, does more injury to society in proportion as he is believed than the utterer of false money. And if this be true of one teacher, it is so still more em phatically of six or a dozen, who unite together for the same purpose, although they may call themselves the faculty of a college or university. Indeed the evil is increased in this way in a much greater ratio than the numerical increase. If the parties who thus combine have sufficient intelligence to know their own want of capacity, they are morally, if not legally, guilty of that species of swindling known as obtaining money under false pretences. Nor has he who points out to us what is bad or spurious done his duty as an honest citizen until he has also indicated to us where the good or genuine is to be found; for who would feel more than half satisfied with one who, if his lips were parched with thirst, would inform him that the water of a particular well was not wholesome, except he also told him where the good water was to be found? At least such are our views on the subject. Nor do we think we ought to be the less willing to point out the pure and refreshing fountain, because its owners entertain theological opinions which are somewhat different from our own.

We will now allude briefly to what we consider the best means of securing a thorough education, and then mention some of the American institutions which, in our opinion, avail themselves of those means with most effect. Incidentally we shall speak of certain defects; but we prefer not to indicate the institutions at which we have found the latter most prevalent. In our view no language, ancient or modern, can be learned without an attempt to speak it to a greater or less extent. If we devoted ourselves forever to merely trans-

lating any language, declining its nouns and conjugating its verbs, we should only have an imperfect knowledge of it; we should, indeed, know the words when we *saw* them, and understand what they mean, but if we *heard* them read or spoken, they would, in general, sound as strangely to us as if we had never studied the dialect to which they belong.

This would be a serious defect if we never had any use of it, or did not intend ever to use it, for conversational purposes; it would be pretty much the same as to confine ourselves to theorems in geometry or algebra, without making any attempt to illustrate those theorems. In demonstrating a proposition in either of those sciences, we acquire a familiarity not only with the principles on which it is founded, but also with those which form the bases of other propositions; so that we are enabled to deduce one set of facts or series of truths from another. Thus, for example, after we have fully demonstrated that the three interior angles of any triangle are together equal to two right angles, and that the square described on the hypothenuse of any triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the base and perpendicular, we become acquainted with a set of principles which enable us to understand several other propositions of whose nature we had previously been ignorant.

In a similar manner, our efforts to speak any language makes us familiar with words whose real signification we should never have learned by translating alone. This is true of the particles both of Latin and Greek, especially of the latter, which has so large a variety of them. Let any one try it if only for a few months, and then see with how much greater facility he can translate any author that he had previously been reading. He will find that particles, especially adverbs of time and place, have much more meaning than he had ever supposed before; nay, that the want of understanding those particles, now rendered so familiar to him by the necessity of examining their nature, and comparing it with that of the particles of the vernacular, presents greater obstacles to his progress in translating than any other deficiency whatever.

That it requires a good deal of time and study to learn to use either Greek or Latin colloquially with even a tolerable degree of fluency, is very true; although by no means so much as is commonly supposed, even by those who consider themselves good classical scholars. But were the time and labor required three times as much as they are, they would be

fully compensated for by the results obtained. Thus, let us suppose that a student devotes two hours a day to the translation of Horace or Juvenal without being able to make very satisfactory progress; that is, reading with some difficulty, having to refer to the dictionary rather frequently, and without deriving much pleasure from what he reads. Let him devote one hour daily of this time for some months to Latin conversation, under the auspices of a competent instructor, then return to the translation, and see whether he cannot translate with much more facility than he could have done had he continued to devote the two hours to it as formerly, without devoting any time to conversation. Thus the faculty of expressing his ideas orally, in the language of Cicero and Virgil, would be an addition to his stock of utilitarian accomplishments, which may be said to have cost him nothing. If it be urged that the gain thus acquired arises more from the increased interest awakened in the student by the habit of speaking a classic language than from the merits of the colloquial system *per se* there is no need to deny the fact, since it matters but little what has been the motive of the student in acquiring more knowledge than usual, provided he has acquired it. But whatever increases the taste of a student for any study, whatever stimulates the interest he takes in it, is an advantage by itself.

There are many professors, who would have us believe that it is absurd to speak Latin or Greek, while they cause their students to devote a large proportion of their time to scanning Latin and Greek verse. Now, is not the latter a little more absurd than the former? This will be the more readily assented to if it is borne in mind that no one knows at the present day how either the Greeks or Romans scanned their verse; that the most eminent modern scholars can only furnish us with conjectures as to Greek and Latin quantity. What can be more ridiculously absurd, or pedantic, for example, than to speak as follows: "I do not, indeed, speak Latin; I never learned it, because it is useless; but I know the exact quantity of every syllable in Homer and Virgil; there is not an ode or a satire in Horace but I can scan."

Is there any intelligent person, having any pretensions to common sense, who would believe such a statement? We think not; but we are not the less aware that there are many that attend college commencements for the purpose of making a display of their erudition who, without being capable of ex-

pressing a single idea in either Greek or Latin, will not scruple to interrupt whole classes by queries in regard to quantity or versification which might have puzzled Aristophanes or Juvenal. This sort of thing has become a great nuisance. Doubtless those who indulge in it imagine that they prove themselves great scholars; but it is the cheapest kind of scholarship. Just one hour devoted to almost any little treatise on scanning or versification would enable even one who never had any accurate knowledge of any language but his own (if indeed he is quite familiar with even that) to puzzle the most thoroughly trained graduating class in the country; although, perhaps, none would be more puzzled than himself if asked to scan the next verse. If asked to scan it in the language in which he pretends to be so profoundly learned, it is ten to one that he might as well be addressed in Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Far be it from us to undervalue translating from a classic author either as a means of mental discipline or a means of acquiring a knowledge of the classic language; but some translate so mechanically as to derive but little profit in one way or the other from the exercise. We do not mean, indeed, that all students should translate alike. The only way beginners should be required to translate is word for word, taken in grammatical order. When the student has made some progress in the language, he should be encouraged to proceed exactly in the order of the original. By this means he would become familiar not only with the author's style, but also with his mode of thinking. Still better is it to have the student translate the sense of the original, giving expression to it in the most appropriate words of the vernacular; by this mode he acquires a pure, perspicuous and energetic style in his own language in proportion as he makes progress in rendering himself familiar with the original.

This is the most difficult mode of translating; and yet even when well done it is not sufficient. Let the student translate as he may, he ought to be required to enter into the spirit of the author as much as possible. First, he should make himself familiar with his subject, then with his main object, then with his peculiarities of style, so as to be able to point out characteristics in which he differs from other authors. Merely to be able to translate a passage from any author is no sufficient evidence that the student understands that author, since he may translate by rote; he may be so "crammed" that he can give a very good version of one

sentence or paragraph while he could not render a word of the following, or even the previous sentence. Yet this is the sort of translating which is most common. For one who can intelligently explain, who understands how far he has proceeded in his journey, or who is able to tell why the author makes use of one form of expression in a particular place rather than another, there are ten who scarcely associate any ideas with the words with which they render the original. It need hardly be said that this exercise, if such it may be called, is simply mechanical, and contributes but little, if anything, either to the development of the mind or the increase of knowledge. In short, one sentence intelligently rendered, one properly analyzed, whose connection with the context is well understood, and whose characteristics of style can be pointed out and compared with those of other sentences, does more good than whole chapters, or even whole books, which are translated merely by rote, in the manner indicated.

The common habit of requiring students to commit so much to memory, which they do not understand, from the grammar, is another great defect in the American system of education; it is one that discourages thousands by wearying them with dry details at a time when they are incapable of being in any manner interested by them. Those who pursue this system forget that language existed before any grammar could be compled as a means of learning it; and that there are numerous rules even in the best grammars which some of the most eminent scholars have declared erroneous. One rule learned in connection with the passage which illustrates it is worth a score of rules learned by rote, or learned before the student is capable of understanding their meaning. But it is not alone a mass of rules which most of our students are obliged to commit to memory in this way, as so many cabalistic phrases, but also hundreds of "exceptions," whose signification or utility is still more inexplicable to them. What wonder is it, then, that so many are discouraged—led to despair of ever mastering either Greek or Latin, or of even acquiring a tolerable smattering of either language?

In most of our literary institutions the practice of writing compositions is acknowledged to be the most useful and important of all exercises. Great progress has thus been made in recent years. The great difficulty is that, in too many instances, the instructors having charge of this department have never learned to use their pens themselves with any

degree of fluency or precision; and how can they be expected to teach others what they do not understand themselves? Very erroneous opinions are entertained on this subject. Even those whom all expect to know better are often of opinion that any one who has received what is called a liberal education, is capable of giving instructions in composition; forgetting that the surest and best fruits of education consist in writing and speaking well. There is no better precept in Buckingham's admirable Essay on poetry than that contained in the opening couplet:

> "Of all the arts in which the wise excel,
> Nature's chief masterpiece is writing well."

Quintilian, who embodies the views of all the illustrious authors of antiquity on the same subject, including those of Plato, Aristotle, and Longinus, is equally emphatic in enjoining the practice of writing as the great source of all knowledge, and consequently of all mental power. "We must write," he says, "therefore, *as carefully and as much* as we can; for, as the ground, by being dug to a great depth, becomes more fitted for fructifying and nourishing seeds, so improvement of the mind, acquired from more than mere superficial cultivation, pours forth the fruits of study *in richer abundance and retains* them with greater fidelity. For without this precaution the very faculty of speaking extempore will but furnish us *with empty loquacity and words born on the lips. In writing are the roots, in writing are the foundations of eloquence; by writing, resources are stored up, as it were, in a sacred repository, where they may be drawn forth for sudden emergencies or as circumstances require.*"*

If it is thus true that no other study is of greater importance to the student, or more likely to influence his whole future life, it is equally true that in no other study does he require more skilful aid from his instructor; if the latter is not capable of rendering such aid, certain it is that he will do more harm than good.

Most of our literary institutions are still very backward in teaching their students how to *speak*, as if the faculty of

* Scribendum ergo quam diligentissime et quam plurimum. Nam ut terra altius effossa generandis alendisque seminibus fecundior fit: sic profectus non a summo petitus, studiorum fructus et fundit uberius et fidelius continet. Nam, sine hac quidem conscientia, ipsa illa ex tempore dicendi facultas inanem modo loquacitatem dabit, et verba in labris nascentia. Illic radices, illic fundamenta sunt: illic opes velut sanctiore quodam aerario reconditæ unde ad subitos quoque casus quum res exiget proferantur.—*De Institutione Oratoria*, lib. x., c. iii.

expressing their ideas orally with facility and accuracy were but a matter of secondary consideration. Under all circumstances, the ability of speaking appropriately and forcibly is of the greatest value, but it attains its highest utility, and exercises the greatest influence, in republics; hence it is that republics have produced the greatest orators, and that no despotism has produced a Demosthenes or a Cicero. "But the richest fruit of all our study," says Quintilian, "and *the most ample recompense for the extent of our labor, is the faculty of speaking extempore.*"* Further on the same author dwells on the superior importance of writing and speaking. "These qualifications," he says, "depend on *art*; others on *study*; thus we must acquire, as has been already directed, an ample store of the best language; our style must be formed by *much and diligent* composition, that even what is poured forth by us unpremeditatedly may present the appearance of having been previously written, so that after having written much we shall have the power of speaking copiously. For it is *habit* and *exercise* that chiefly beget facility; and if they are intermitted, even but for a short period, *not only will our fluency be diminished, but our mouth may even be closed.*"†

There is not a view we have expressed in the preceding pages on the subject of education in which we are not sustained by authorities equally reliable and illustrious. Of all modern educators, those who have most successfully carried out the different educational plans to which we have thus hurriedly alluded, and which we would earnestly recommend, are the Jesuits. Did we consult our own interests rather than those of education and justice, we should not pay them this tribute, for we are well aware that there are strong prejudices entertained against them by a large proportion even of our own readers—nay, even by those from whose educational institutions we derive ten times as much patronage as we do from those of the Jesuits. But we have nothing to to do with the differences or jealousies between different religious sects; what we pretend to pay attention to, in the best way we can, is the development of the human mind; and as Bacon and other great thinkers, who were not Catholic, have declared the educational system of the Jesuits

* Maximus vero studiorum fructus est, et velut præmium quodam amplissimum longi laboris, ex tempore dicendi facultas.—*Ib.*

† Nam *consuetudo* et exercitatio facilitatem maxime parit, quæ si paullulum intermissa fuerit, non velocitatas illa modo tarditur, sed *ipsum os* quoque concurrit.—*Ib.*, lib. x., c. vii.

to be worthy of imitation,* we may be permitted to give our humble opinion to the same effect. But let us not be misunderstood; we do not mean that all Jesuit colleges are better than others, whether Protestant or Catholic; we believe that there are some of the former which are as defective as any similar institutions; and we are equally satisfied that there are other colleges, both Protestant and Catholic, which are not surpassed even by the best Jesuit colleges.

It is precisely because the Jesuits are such excellent educators that it would afford us great pleasure to contribute, in the slightest manner, to remove the prejudices entertained against them by a large class of well-meaning people; although, in general, so far as we could ever learn, they are as kind and generous as they are learned. It is often urged against the Jesuits that they must be a dangerous class of educators, inasmuch as they have been banished from so many countries But those who reason in this way forget to ask what they have been banished for in nine cases out of ten. It cannot be pretended that the Catholic sovereigns of France, Spain, and Portugal banished them on account of their zeal for the Catholic religion: the truth is that they were banished in each instance for their opposition to despotism. Let those who doubt this mention a single instance in which they have been banished from a republic, except from one which their own teachings had established, as in South America, when they excited the implacable ire of despotic Spain by instructing her oppressed colonists in the art of self-government.

Even those who have abused the Jesuits most have felt constrained to give them credit for noble qualities. No one, for example, has reviled them more than Voltaire, yet he speaks of them as "that singular society, in which *it must be confessed there have been found, and are to be found still, individuals of very extraordinary merit.*"† He could never forgive them as a body, because they did more with pen and tongue to refute his arguments against Christianity than all other societies and sects. They could forgive him, however, as history abundantly proves; although they might justly regard him

* "The chief reason," says the philosopher, "why the Jesuits make such excellent tutors is, perhaps, their being versed in civil as well as collegiate life, so as to join the gentleman with the scholar."—Bacon's Works, *Preliminaries*, Section iii.

† Philosoph. Dict. art. the Jesuits.

as an ingrate, since it was they who not only educated him, but secured him that position in society which enabled him to become famous at once. Both Father Porée and Father Jay, the professors under whom he was first placed, readily discovered that he possessed the germ of a great mind; both also dealt gently with the independence which characterized the opinions of their eccentric pupil. It was well known before he left the college of the Jesuits that he entertained anti-Christian views; but this did not prevent the Abbé Chateauneuf from recommending him to the celebrated Madame Ninon l'Enclos as an ingenious and brilliant youth; and she was so much pleased with him that she presented him two thous nd livres for the purpose of purchasing a small library. Another Jesuit abbé (Chaulieu) introduced him to Madame de Maintenon, who in turn introduced him to the brilliant court of Louis XIV.

Singularly enough, the gravest fault attributed by Voltaire to his old instructors, and his most formidable antagonists in his attacks on the religion of Christ, was Pride, which he makes synonymous with their name in his article on the subject in his Philosophical Dictionary, in which he also avails himself of the opportunity to compare them to Lucifer. "What is it, then," he asks, "that was their ruin? Pride. What! it may be asked by some, were the Jesuits prouder than other monks? Yes; and so much so that they procured a lettre-de-cachet against an ecclesiastic for calling them monks."

But pride is a noble passion; if it sometimes degenerates into vice, it is that of the vigorous and independent mind, not that of the feeble and subservient. Hence it is that Montesquieu tells us that women are too feeble to be proud; they are but vain.* Proud men seldom commit any of the darker class of crimes, even when their minds are not strengthened by a superior education, as those of the Jesuits confessedly are. There is no crime that a proud man is more likely to be guilty of than that opposition to the will of a tyrant which is called treason. Virginius, for example, was a proud man when he preferred to stab his beloved daughter to the heart rather than see her dishonored by the tyrant; and William Tell was a proud man when he cut short the career of the modern tyrant in a somewhat similar manner.

---

* Elles sont trop foibles, pour avoir de l'orgueil; elles n'ont que de la vanité. —*De l' Esprit des Lois*, tome i, p. 340.

True, Milton describes Satan as the impersonation of pride, but in doing so he makes even the demon so august and sublime a personage that many critics have represented him as the real hero of Paradise Lost. Be it remembered that in the case of Satan, as well as in that of Virginius and William Tell, pride assumes the form of opposition to individual power; in short, the prominent idea of the Arch-fiend, as given by Milton, is that such was his pride and his love of liberty that he was impatient of the control of even the Creator of the universe. Supposing it to be true, then, that the Jesuits are so proud that they are always inclined to rebel against despotic power, would it not be rather illogical for us to dislike them on this account? Are we not also opposed to despotic power? If we are, should we not rather sympathize with them, since they think so much like ourselves on so important a subject? It might be different had we any evidence of their being opposed to republics even when King Mob is as despotic and tyrannical as any individual tyrant that ever lived. Let us, therefore, be frank and honest, and give the Jesuits full credit for their superior educational abilities and appliances, without being in the least afraid that they will undermine our free institutions.

Our readers are already familiar with our impressions of the principal Jesuit colleges of the United States. It would be superfluous, therefore, to repeat them here. Nor could it be expected that we could attend all the commencements even of our first-class colleges, since most of them are held nearly, if not exactly, at the same time. We pursue a course, however, which we are sure is equally satisfactory to our readers. That is, we embody the substance of the accounts given of those annual exercises by journals which we know to have men of education and ability connected with them precisely for such purposes; men in whose judgment and veracity we have full confidence. It is with this understanding, for example, that we give an extract or two from the Washington *National Intelligencer's* report of the last commencement of Georgetown College, D. C. The writer first takes a cursory glance at the history of the institution, which, as it is not without interest to the friends of education in all parts of the country, we quote as follows:

"The commencement exercises at this venerable seat of learning took place yesterday at nine o'clock, before a large and fashionable audience. If within a few years the population of the district had not materially changed, and our circulation of late been considerably increased, it would

assuredly be a work of supererogation to say that, in 1785, several gentlemen, among them the Rev. John Carroll, afterwards archbishop of Baltimore, formed the design of building the college, which was effected four years subsequently by the erection of the first house; that, in 1792, the schools commenced, and, in 1798, it was designated "The College of Georgetown, Potomac River, State of Maryland;" and that, in May, 1815, Congress raised it to the rank of a university—a rank which since then it has sustained so well that its reputation is as wide as the continent. But, for the reasons above stated, we will add a few facts which must prove interesting to many of our readers. With that intuitive perception which always characterizes the Jesuit fathers, the selection of the college site, on the northern or left bank of the Potomac, so peculiarly healthy and picturesque, was an admirable one.

"The college grounds are unequalled in the district for extent, variety of scenery, and cultivation. It possesses, as might be expected of an institution where so many learned men are always to be found, a select library of 30,000 volumes, among which there are 100 volumes printed between the years 1460 and 1520, three manuscripts written before the year 1400, and one in 1620. The museum contains an elegant and well-arranged cabinet of minerals and many geological specimens, besides an extensive collection of shells. At the distance of about four hundred yards from the college is the beautiful astronomical observatory, sixty feet long and thirty feet wide, divided from east to west into three rooms. In addition to a first-class meridian circle, a telescope with a four-inch glass, two fine siderial clocks, a transit instrument, an equatorial telescope, giving powers from 25 to 400; there are five portable astronomical instruments, and a library of 500 choice works on astronomy, mathematics, and the physical sciences, the whole being under the very erudite director of the observatory and professor of mathematics, Rev. James Curley, S. J., a gentleman whose ability is equalled only by his extreme modesty, and, it may be, *bonhomie*.

"The Medical Department, in Washington, forms no trifling acquisition to this abode of learning. In the college there are many societies and associations, which time has tended to make *en permanence*, such as the Philodemic, the Philonomosian, the Philistorian, the Philharmonic, and the Academic Societies, and the Reading Room and Dramatic Association, the latter of which is scarcely equalled, in the variety of its wardrobe and scenery, by any theatre in the world.

"The college faculty are universally admitted to be at least equal to the same number of *savans* attached to any other university, while the history of the country during the past half century proves that the discipline of this institution tends to send forth men competent to fill the most exalted positions. And, indeed, such everywhere is the characteristic of the training imparted by the Jesuits."

From this extract we learn three leading facts: 1, that the Congress of the United States has not participated in the prejudices entertained against the Jesuits, but, on the contrary has rather evinced a predilection in their favor; 2, that the Jesuits have proved themselves worthy of that honor; 3, that the principal organ of public opinion in the national capital has the liberality and manliness to do full justice to their high character and successful efforts as educators. It seems that, like most of our literary institutions, George

town has suffered severely from the war; yet the subjoined extract shows not only that it still retained a large number of students, but also maintained its proverbially high character for educational thoroughness:

"The following recapitulation shows the number of students now in attendance: In the senior department there are 43; in the junior, 35; in the preparatory, 114; and in the medical, 127; making a total of 319, which, considering the fiery ordeal that the country has just been passing through, may be said to show a very satisfactory exhibit.

"The exercises yesterday displayed a high order of merit. 'The Disinterment of Napoleon,' by Samuel H. Anderson, was an elegant production; 'The Triumph of Religion,' by Stephen Douglas, was a masterpiece of composition, which, save in a few fine passages, was very well delivered; 'The Drama,' by Francis P. S. Lafferty, afforded much pleasure by the extensive research and animated delivery of its author; 'Boadicea, the British Queen,' by Julius Soper, was happily arranged, though the voice was not well modulated; 'Le Paysan du Danube au Senat Romain,' by Harry Walters, for purity of style and pronunciation would do credit to an educated Parisian; 'Love of Country,' by Edward McCahill, followed; 'The Potomac,' by Charles F. Naily, was a smooth piece of versification, neatly delivered, for which he received a shower of bouquets; 'A Mejico,' by Louis Puebla, was well received; 'Moscow,' by Hugh Kelly, showed decided talent, and was very well delivered; 'Influence of Woman,' by James C. Normile, was a high eulogy paid to the virtues of the softer sex in elegant diction; 'Jerusalem,' by Eugene M. Morrison, displayed talent; but the most beautiful composition, as it seemed to us, was 'The Exile's Return,' by James V. Coleman, a youth of scarcely sixteen summers, whose musical utterances, as we write, are still ringing in our ears. (He subsequently received four, and, if he had not been promoted during the term, would have won five medals.) 'Religion in Society,' by R. Ross Perry, A. B., was a thoughtful, philosophic, and well-delivered analysis of the condition of society before and since the dawn of Christianity; while the Valedictory, by James F. Fitzpatrick, paid a touching, heartfelt tribute to the college faculty.

"The graduation and distribution of medals and premiums followed, the announcements being made by Rev. Joseph O'Hagan, S. J., in his usual felicitous manner, and the awards made by the Most Reverend Archbishop Spalding, assisted by the Rev John Early, President of the College:

"The degree of Doctor of Music was conferred on John Caulfield, of Ireland.

"The degree of A. M. was conferred on R. Ross Perry, A. B., D. C; William L. Nicodemus, U. S. A.; John H. Thompson, M. D., England; Cypriano Zegarra, A. B., Peru; Walter S. McFarland, A. B., D. C; James H. Dooley, A. B., Virginia.

"The degree of A. B. was conferred on the following students: James F. Fitzpatrick, Alabama; Joseph Forrest, District of Columbia; John C. Wilson, District of Columbia; Edward McCahill, New York; Francis P. S. Lafferty, Pennsylvania; John A. Pizzini, Virginia.

"In the class of Natural Right, the gold cross was awarded to R. Ross Perry, A. B., of Washington, and the usual rewards of medals and premiums succeeded, to youth from every section of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, &c.

"At the close the archbishop made a brief address expressive of the pleasure that he felt in witnessing for the first time the annual commence-

ment, which was the fiftieth, it being eighty years since the foundation of the college. It possessed, he said, the prestige of antiquity, and increased as the country had increased; under the shadow of the capital, it prospered as the government had prospered. He bore witness to the studiousness of the young men present, and remarked that those trained there would be a solace to their parents and ornaments to society. He inculcated in a few words the duty of religious observances, which would lift them up towards the sphere of the angels of God. 'Be faithful,' he added, 'to the instructions here received, and let the memory thereof guide you, so as to be ornaments to your country and futurity, to which this is but the preface.'"

This needs no comment at our hands; suffice it to say that there is not an important statement which it contains of the truth of which we are not convinced, either from our own personal observation, or from the testimony of those in whom we have the most implicit confidence. It is not strange, then, that a large proportion of the students of Georgetown are Protestants of different denominations; nor have we heard of one whom the most zealous of the fathers have sought to convert to their own religion.

Without any disposition to disparage other institutions, we may say that there is but one other Jesuit college in the United States which has any just claim to be ranked with that of Georgetown—we mean the College of the Holy Cross, at Worcester, Massachusetts. On this point we believe, there is no dispute among the fraternity themselves; all of whom assign the same high rank to the two institutions mentioned. In noticing the latter, two years ago, we ventured to express the opinion that, although the Legislature of Massachusetts has sometimes been guilty of certain indiscretions unworthy of the superior intelligence of the Bay State, if it were aware of the high standard of education at Holy Cross College, it would discard its prejudices against popery for once, and unanimously grant it the charter which, in a thoughtless, not to say evil, moment, it had refused some years previously. The trial has since been made, and we are glad to add, for the sake of all concerned, that it has resulted as we had predicted. Hitherto the students of Holy Cross had to get their diplomas from Georgetown, even when they proved themselves worthy of the highest honors that could be conferred by old Harvard itself; but this disgrace to Massachusetts no longer exists, for the *Boston Post* informs us, in its excellent report of the recent commencement, that "the last Legislature of the Commonwealth granted the College a charter, thereby placing it on an equal footing with other nstitutions within its borders." The *Post* then

proceeds to give the following account of the commencement exercises:

"The president of the College is Rev. James Clark, S. J., a gentleman of high culture and rare scholastic attainments, and he is assisted by gentlemen every way fitted for the positions they are called upon to occupy. The institution, we are pleased to learn, is in its full tide of success, there being about one hundred and thirty scholars in the various classes, and there is every prospect of a large increase at the commencement of the next collegiate year.

"The weather yesterday was all that could be desired, and, as we before remarked, the attendance was large. His Excellency Gov. Andrew, accompanied by Colonels Adams and Wetherell of his staff, and Surgeon-General Dale, were present. A large number of the clergy of the Catholic Church were also present, among whom we noticed Right Rev. Father McFarland, diocese of Hartford; Very Rev. J. J. Williams, Vicar-General; Rev. James Healy, Secretary of the diocese; Rev. Fathers Denver, Brennan, McShean, Lasco, and Tracy, of Boston; Rev. Fathers O'Riley and Powers, of Worcester; Hughes, of Hartford; Delaney, of Pawtucket; Fagan, of Collinsville; E. M. Sheridan, of Blackstone.

"The study room, in which the exercises were held, is a large and very convenient place for such services. It was very handsomely decorated with evergreens, and long lines of oak leaves entwined together radiated from all parts of the room. Above the platform the American flag was displayed, looped up with beautiful bouquets of fragrant flowers. At an early hour the friends of the institution, and of those who were to bear the more important duties of the day, began to assemble, and by the time assigned for the commencement of the services the room was full, a large portion of the audience being of the fairer sex. At eleven o'clock the exercises were commenced by music by an orchestra composed of students of the college, under the direction of Mr. George P. Burt, Professor of Music in the institution. * * * * *

"Where each one did so well it would be invidious to particularize, and it is sufficient to say that each member of the class did himself great credit. The Valedictory by Edward McSweeney was beautifully written and touchingly delivered, and the Prisoner's Vision, by Mr. Burke, and an essay on War and Warriors, by Mr. Donworth, were excellent.

"At the conclusion of the exercises, the degrees were conferred as follows:

"A. M.—Charles Stone, Esq., of Missouri.

"A. B.—Michael Flattelly, Ireland; James Gavin, Massachusetts; Wm. Halligan, New York; Edward J. P. Kennedy, Canada East; Cornelius F. O'Callaghan, Massachusetts; Michael M. Green, Massachusetts; Francis E. Calligan, Massachusetts; Edward McSweeney, New Hampshire; John P. Donworth, Maine; James Kiely, Massachusetts; all of the graduating class."

This is followed in the report by a long list of students, who, having distinguished themselves in their respective classes, were rewarded with crosses of honor, and premiums, which we are informed were presented to each student by the Governor of the Commonwealth. The report of the proceedings appropriately concludes as follows:

"The diplomas and prizes having been distributed, Gov. Andrew was introduced to the audience and was received with hearty and genuine

applause. He commenced by saying that he congratulated the faculty of the college, the students of the Holy Cross, and all who are its patrons, upon the happy auspices which had attended the services this day. He was glad to see the growing numbers of the college and the continued interest manifested by its friends and patrons. As a citizen of this old Commonwealth he loved and revered every institution where men cultivate sound and honest learning, and whatever may be our differences of opinion, religious or political, we can always agree in our common devotion to that which is the basis of common intelligence. He trusted that the institution would live many prosperous and happy years. The governor then spoke of the care and toil of a student's life, and urged his young friends to persevere in their work until they had surmounted all obstacles, never forgetting that they were citizens of a great republic, where every man has a duty to perform to himself, his country, and his God. The governor was in his happiest vein for speech-making, and his remarks were rapturously applauded.

"The exercises of the day closed with a dinner in the college building, which was attended by the faculty, officers, invited guests, and others. The whole occasion was one long to be remembered by the friends, patrons, and students of the Holy Cross."

Our Jesuit colleges nearer home are entirely of a different character, and our readers will remember that we have spoken of them accordingly from time to time, but without any disposition to be harsh or hypercritical. Whatever has been urged to the contrary by those chiefly interested, our criticisms have been honestly made; yet, if the conductors of any respectable institution thought we did them injustice, we would cheerfully allow them to vindicate themselves in our pages, exacting no condition further than that they would do so like gentlemen.

The institution at Fordham is one of those which have refused to furnish us a copy of their last annual catalogue, because we ventured to make some criticisms on their former one. The loss, however, is not serious; we can assure the Reverend President that he has not in the least disturbed our equanimity by his declining to favor us with a glance at that pamphlet. At the same time, we may be permitted to think that the president of St. Xavier's College, in this city, has acted much more like a Christian minister, an educator, and a philosopher in pursuing the opposite course, for the Rev. Father Loyzance has had the politeness to send a messenger to our office with a copy of his catalogue.

Now, if the reader will have the curiosity to turn to our "Commencement" article in the number for September, 1864, of this journal, he will see how much more harshly we spoke of St. Xavier's College than of Fordham. Trifling as this fact may seem at first sight, it affords new proof of the injustice of holding a whole community responsible for the con-

duct of an individual. If we knew no Jesuit president but the gentleman who occupies that position at Fordham, and did not reason according to "the humanities," we might be led to think that all Jesuit presidents are either a little churlish or somewhat shy of criticism. But the different conduct of Father Loyzance would be sufficient by itself to refute such a theory; and then we could only infer from the course of the Fordham president that he is a little churlish or a little timid of criticism. We prefer to believe that the latter rather than the former is the weakness to which we are to attribute the loss of not getting the Fordham catalogue, and we think it will be admitted in due time that we have some grounds for that opinion.

About a year and a half ago we wished to see the interior of Fordham College, but were informed by a friend, who, by the way, is a good Catholic, that the fathers belonging to that institution had no love for reviews or reviewers. "But," said he, "if you go to them from some of the daily or weekly papers, and tell them you come to give them a good puff, you will be received with open arms, and be treated to Greek and Latin to your heart's content, if not exactly to the kind you want." From this we inferred that our only course was to proceed to the college *incognito*. Accordingly we drove over one fine morning, and tried to look as good-natured and harmless as possible. After waiting for some time, we had the honor of being introduced to the president, who received us kindly enough. The usual compliments being passed, we said that we were persons who took some interest in education, and should like to be allowed the privilege of being present at some of the recitations, if agreeable to him. We shall never forget the scrutinizing though inoffensive look which this remark elicited, first at ourselves, and then at certain hieroglyphics on our modest vehicle, which unfortunately, we thought at the time, happened to be opposite the parlor window. The father hesitated for several minutes, as if asking himself what was best to be done under the circumstances. At last he said that only his junior classes were in session, but that we might call some other time. It is but fair to say, that there was no appearance of cunning about the father; any one could see in his honest face what the difficulty was. "Now," thought he, "this is one of those know-nothings who hate us Catholics; he just wants to spread some injurious report against us, and it is best to get rid of him as quietly as we can."

Strongly suspecting that he had some such cogitations as these, although he used no uncivil or discourteous word, we remarked: "If it is contrary to your rules, Father, to admit strangers at this time, we do not wish you to make any exception in our case; if otherwise, we will not take any liberty with your students, but be perfectly satisfied with such questions as the professors may think proper to propose." This seemed to remove all objection. The president cordially informed us that our wish should be complied with; and in little more than half an hour after we witnessed some of the efforts in translating Greek and Latin of the two principal classes.

Neither, indeed, impressed us very highly; from what we had heard we had not expected much; yet we confess we felt not a little surprised that an institution which made such loud pretensions could show so little to sustain those pretentions. The fact that we have never made any public statement of this, before, may, we think, be taken as at least presumptive evidence that we had no ill will towards Fordham College or its faculty; and we have just as little to-day as we had a year and a half, or five years ago. Nor have we related this little episode by way of making out a case of any kind against that institution; all we mean to show by it is that, let the cause be what it may, the reverend president is a little timid of criticism. In our opinion, it would be much better for him to try to defy criticism. This seems to be the course which Father Loyzance has been pursuing at St. Xavier's College during the past year; and we have reason to believe that, although his predecessors left him an herculean task to perform, his efforts thus far have been attended with considerable success.

Since first-class institutions of all denominations regularly send us their catalogues to make such comments on them as we think proper, we need not feel much annoyed if we are occasionally slighted by a fourth-rate one. In September, 1864, we criticised the catalogues of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, (New York,) but each has been forwarded to us this year as promptly and politely as ever. The venerable and learned chancellor of New York University does us the honor of sending us his catalogue as regularly as he does to any other person whatever; and several other chancellors do the same. That of Fordham is, indeed, not the only college that has withheld its catalogue; more than half a dozen others of different denominations have pursued the same

course, but not one of them is above the fourth grade, so that it is not worth while to mention them.

But we have yet to speak of one other Catholic college, which, although young in years, deserves to be ranked with the best we have mentioned, for the thoroughness of its educational system, and for the excellent results which it has already accomplished; to this we need hardly add that we allude to Manhattan College, so delightfully situated at Manhattanville, on the right bank of the Hudson, and within view of the Central Park. We have devoted more space to Catholic colleges than to the colleges of Protestant denominations, because the former receive less attention from our daily and weekly journals than the latter, and are consequently less known. At least fifty of our readers have read copious accounts of the commencements of New York University, Columbia College, Harvard College, Yale College, &c., for every one who has read any account of the Catholic colleges we have mentioned. And let it be remembered that in seeking to remedy this we are merely acting in accordance with our general plan, namely, to tell our readers what they do not know or have but a vague notion of, rather than what they are already familiar with. But, in the present instance, we have the additional inducement to enter into particulars, that a new institution which is doing the work of an old one deserves to be encouraged. Of all the catalogues which we receive, not one is more tastefully gotten up than that of Manhattan College; it also possesses the distinction of containing in almost every number suggestions on education, which we take pleasure in reproducing for the benefit of others. Those who are not aware of its character will be able to form an idea of its high standard of education from the following extract from its catalogue for 1864–5:

"There are, at least, two public examinations during the year. To these all who take an interest in education are cordially invited. Nor need they be mere spectators; the faculty are not only willing, but desirous, that they should take an active part in the examinations, especially in those of the higher classes. Besides requiring the student to translate any passage in the part of the text-book which he has read, the examiner may propose his questions in Latin; and the graduating class may be addressed in Greek.

"In the higher mathematics, a similar discretion is allowed; in other words, the examiner may propose any questions that occur to him in the science upon which the class under examination are engaged.

"These suggestions are made in view of the well-known fact that the 'cramming' system is far too general at the present day; that students are taught to answer particular questions apparently with equal intelligence and facility; while they are utterly confounded if asked questions

precisely similar without being 'prepared' in the details. Hence it is that the faculty of Manhattan College invite the public not to an *exhibition*, but to an *examination*.

"The genuineness of the oral discussions and addresses may be tested in a similar manner. Any gentleman who attends the examination may propose a subject for discussion; although the most experienced parliamentary debaters cannot discuss a subject with any degree of thoroughness without having previously reflected on it; nevertheless it will be sufficiently evident from such a test whether the students have really learned to reason and to make ready use of their resources to convince or refute, as the case may be. But a still more reliable test is that of requiring the student to deliver an extemporaneous address, however brief, on any subject; and it is one which may be applied by any intelligent person at this institution.

"In order to estimate the difference between an exhibition and an examination, it is necessary to bear in mind what is the object of sending boys or young men to college. Is not that object twofold—to acquire knowledge, and to be capable of making use of that knowledge? No matter how much we may know, it is valuable only in proportion as we can apply it, or communicate it to others; and in order to enable us to do this our faculties must be trained. The learning of which we cannot avail ourselves is, indeed, gold, but it is like that hidden in the mine. In short, in order to educate a young man, he must be taught to reason, to reflect, to express his ideas with clearness and facility both orally and in writing; if he is only taught to say and do certain things at certain times, so that he may *seem* what he is not, his education is only that of the parrot, and he is taught to be deceptive, if not absolutely dishonest, at the same time."

No one who understands the subject will deny that these observations are just; but we value them chiefly for their representative character; we appreciate them because we know that they do not refer to mere theories, but to work actually accomplished—because we have had opportunities of *seeing* that the president does not merely tell us those things, but that he carries them into practical effect. Although present ourselves at one of its recent examinations, we prefer giving an extract from the report of a journal whose views on the subject we would have accepted with confidence even if we had not been in a position to test their accuracy "The classes were examined," says the critic alluded to, "both in the classic languages and in mathematics; and we assure our readers that we give but feeble expression to our estimate of the results when we say that at no other college in this country, of the many we have visited, have the students acquitted themselves so well in each department. Some would translate a passage in Latin with commendable accuracy, but err in almost every sentence in Greek; others would be quite critical in Greek, but incapable of rendering a line in Juvenal or Horace. Again, some would evince a respectable acquaintance with both Latin and Greek, but

scarcely any acquaintance with the mathematics; while those who understood the latter even tolerably could not pretend to understand either Latin or Greek. But, incredible as it may seem to those who have not witnessed the examination, the students at Manhattan College can turn from elaborate and accurate demonstrations in geometry, trigonometry, or even the differential calculus, to reading the Odyssey of Homer or the Satires of Juvenal with a facility and confidence which many other students could not display in turning from one book in the vernacular to another. This intelligent familiarity elicited the admiration of all on Saturday last. Still more agreeably surprised were the best judges at the fluency with which some twelve or fifteen students conversed together in Latin on various subjects, and promptly answered any who addressed them in that language.

"This is one of the peculiar features of Manhattan College, considered as an American institution. In other American colleges, indeed, some Latin phrases are occasionally spoken, certain subjects are sometimes discussed also in Latin, but only such as are committed to memory for the occasion. But we believe Manhattan College is the only institution in this country whose students are ready to converse in Latin on any subject which may be proposed to them. But if the student should never have occasion to speak the language after he left college, there would still remain the unanswerable argument in favor of using it orally, that by no other means can the learner acquire a thorough knowledge of any Latin author worth reading.

"The facility with which the students of this institution can speak as well as translate and write the language of Cicero, and demonstrate propositions in the most difficult of the sciences is not, however, the only proof they furnish us that they are attaining the best results of a collegiate education. They also read several English essays on the occasion referred to, any of which would do no discredit to many a professional writer. The majority exhibited not a little thought and research, and afforded evidence that they are the productions of minds which are not only well trained, but, considering their youth, well stored with ideas."

None capable of judging, who attended the commencement examinations the first days of July last, will be disposed to deny any of the statements made in this extract; and among the learned men whom we observed near the platform were professors of the University of New York, Columbia

College, and the Free Academy—gentlemen who seemed to vie with each other in their appreciation of the highly creditable manner in which most of the students passed through the severe ordeal to which they were subjected by their professors, and such visitors as chose to take part in the examination, on being invited to do so by the president. We are certainly of opinion that neither the Fathers of St. Xavier's nor those of Fordham could have shown such good work as the Brothers did on this occasion. Indeed, the University of New York is the only one of our local institutions at whose examinations we have witnessed such excellent evidences of superior mental training.

Certain it is that Columbia College has not been in the habit, for the last seven years, of doing its work so thoroughly; although we are glad to add that it has exhibited considerable improvement during the past year. Without meaning any disparagement of the efforts of the late chancellor, we feel certain that, if the Rev. Dr. Barnard, his successor, will only be allowed to carry out his own views, "Old Columbia" will soon recover its ancient prestige. We cannot say, however, we have much confidence that so proper and necessary a thing will be done. Too many of the rulers of Columbia College are petty tyrants of the most obstinate and vulgar kind; among these is a fourth-rate lawyer, who imagines that because he has some smattering of Blackstone and Coke, and a long antiquated handle to his name, he has a right to lord it over all the rest. Another thing that weighs like an incubus on old Columbia is "Anthon's Classics," or rather that gentleman's "copious notes;" if the latter were cut out, the former would do very well, a suggestion which we beg leave to make to the new president, for the case is really a desperate one.

We are glad to see that we have no reason this time to find fault with either Harvard or Yale, for both seem to realize more and more what that portion of the public that is capable of judging expect from them, if only as an example to institutions not possessed of equal advantages. We would cheerfully give extracts from some of the reports of their commencements which we have seen, adding our own testimony to their general truthfulness; but they have already received such extensive publicity that there are few, if any, of our readers who have not seen them.

In glancing accidentally at the pile of manuscript that has accumulated on our table within the last hour or two we are reminded that it will be impossible for us to carry out our

intentions in the present number relative to our female seminaries; we must, however, allude to two or three. The first female catalogue that presents itself is somewhat of a curiosity in its way; we mean that of the Rockland Female Institute for 1864. We presume that the one for 1865 is not yet ready; but, as it will doubtless be still more attractive than this, we hope that somebody will favor us with a copy. That before us gives us some very handsome specimens of the English language, and some very interesting facts as to the fine salt-water bathing for the ladies to be found at Nyack; the carriages and saddle horses furnished by the reverend president of the institute, "at a moderate charge;" the immeasurable superiority of that region to all others, &c. After giving a good deal of information of this kind, it says: "Young ladies, with any appreciation of the sublime and beautiful in nature, cannot prosecute their education *in the midst of such surroundings without feeling their inspiring and elevating influences in the formation of their character.*" (p. 18.) A page or two further on we are told that, "the Latin language, *as forming the basis of a large part of the English and other modern languages*, is carefully taught," &c. (p. 22.) We should like to know of what "part" of Webster's Dictionary does it form the basis?—of the beginning, the middle, or the end? Or must the Anglo-Latin words be picked out from the Anglo-Saxon and placed on a basis? Great stress is placed on "the refining influence" exercised on the young ladies by the privilege of allowing them to sit at table, and occasionally converse with the faculty. Finally, by way of removing all doubt as to the superiority of everything at Nyack, we are presented with four pages of "testimonials," in the smallest type. On examining these we find that they emanate from such high authorities in scholastic matters as the "Paterson Guardian," the "Auburn Daily Advertiser," the "Rockland Daily Journal," the "Wisconsin Chief," &c., &c. We confess that, in reading the highly appreciative, though rather ungrammatical, notices (most of which look very much like each other) given by these journals, we are reminded of a letter once written by the reverend president, enquiring *what extent* of a notice would be given him should he advertise. But, of nothing does the whole affair remind us so forcibly, as of that passage in the ninth Satire of Juvenal, in which the following lines occur.

> "Nam *lingua* mali pars *pessima* servi
> Deterior tamen hic, qui liber non erit illis,
> Quorum animas et farre suo custodit et ære."

In agreeable contrast with this is the catalogue of the Deer Park Female Institute. The latter indulges in no hyperbolical expressions of any kind, but gives a plain, chaste, and modest statement of facts. We compare the two together because they have several other features in common. The principal of one as well as of the other is a clergyman; and, if we do not mistake, they belong to the one denomination. If the Rockland Institute is situated on the Hudson the Deer Park Institute is situated on the Delaware, at Port Jervis, New York; and if the young ladies of the former cannot but feel an inspiring and elevating influence from its "surroundings," surely those of the latter ought to feel pretty well inspired and elevated, too; for we know of none anywhere who can look out from their class-rooms or dormitories on more romantic or sublime scenery. In twenty minutes they can not only cross the Delaware, but pass from the State of New York to that of Pennsylvania, thence to New Jersey, and meet on their way the Erie Railroad and the Delaware and Hudson Canal. But the principal has understanding enough to know that it would be quite possible for an institution to have all these advantages, and yet afford but a very indifferent *education* for young ladies. Accordingly he indulges in no high flown language about his "surroundings," but depends rather on other means for elevating the character of the students.

Now, if we compare the inside machinery in the one Institute with that of the other, we shall find just such a difference as might be expected; the difference between *words* and *deeds*, or that between the fruit and the leaves which sometimes cover it. We suppose we need hardly say that we do not judge either institution merely by its catalogue; although in general we regard what is said in such pamphlets as a pretty safe criterion of the amount of culture and taste possessed by the principals who issue them. We have, however, had a full opportunity of seeing what is done at the Deer Park Institute; in one of our peregrinations on the Erie Railroad, in October last, we were induced to visit it, and we shall never forget the agreeable surprise we experienced from the superior proficiency of the higher classes both in the ornamental and useful branches of female education. There was no confusion there, no effort at display; the young ladies underwent the examinations of their professors and performed all their exercises with an ease and grace that would have done credit to matrons of culture and refinement receiving company in their own parlors or drawing-rooms.

Still further to the west, it has been our privilege to visit another female seminary—one which, so far as we can judge from appearances, reputation, and other circumstances (for it was during vacation we saw it), is scarcely surpassed in situation, scenery, accommodations, or system of teaching by any similar institution in the east; we mean St. Mary's Academy, Notre Dame, Indiana, which is conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Cross. It is admitted among the enlightened and liberal of all countries and denominations that there are no better seminaries for young ladies than those presided over by nuns. Apart from the excellent example which they afford by the purity of their conduct, their sincere, unostentatious piety, and their proverbial benevolence, they are in general ladies of high culture and refinement; those of them devoted to education invariably so; and in this country especially there is scarcely a community of them in which there are not included ladies of different nationalities, each capable of teaching her native language in its purity. In addition to this, one can teach painting, another music, another an elegant system of penmanship, &c., so that the students have the benefit of the accumulated knowledge and combined accomplishments of the whole convent. This is particularly true of St. Mary's Academy, which, we believe, is the parent community of the whole sisterhood of the Holy Cross. The buildings and grounds are admirably suited in every respect for the purpose to which they are devoted; but we regret that it is now impossible for us to describe either in our diminished space, further than to remark, in general terms, that the buildings contain all the modern improvements, including steam-heating apparatus throughout, baths in connection with the dormitories, &c. We can bear testimony to the superior excellence of the arrangements, for we had the honor of having all pointed out to us and explained by one of the sisters, whose intelligence and willingness to give every necessary information eminently qualified her for the task. On seeing the whole institution, we were not surprised to learn that two-thirds of the students are Protestants of different denominations. As we cannot speak from our own knowledge of the system of education, we subjoin an extract from the report of one of the Chicago papers of last commencement:

"The address ended, the reporters were invited to a reception, and then drive over to the academy for young ladies, established in connection with the university. General Sherman and his lady were already

there, and the 'Grand Entrance March,' prepared for the occasion opened the proceedings. It was a very brilliant sight to behold such a number of fair young girls, and beautiful women as were there present. The hall, like that at Notre Dame, was arrayed as a theatre, and decorated with a profusion of banners and streamers. Most of the young ladies were dressed in white, and arrayed on either side of the stage in ascending steps. Large crimson curtains fell before the stage, and served as a proscenium. Below, in a roomy circle, four grand pianos were placed, and they were presided over by as many lovely girls, whose long white fingers ran over the keys like the feet of so many tripping fairies, and made the music wake up in a passion. The audience presented quite a picturesque appearance. The blue and gold of the military—the variously colored silks of the ladies' dresses—the long dark robes of the members of the faculty and the clergy—the black hoods and white tunics of the nuns—the young female visitors in white—and the rosy faces of the Young America—all tended to make a picture not unworthy the pencil of a great artist.

"We have devoted already so much space to the subject that we have none left in which to give a detailed criticism of the performances. It would be unjust, however, not to say that the singing and playing, both on harp and piano, were good, and that Miss K. Putnam delighted all with her sweet voice, and fine execution of the Solo 'Our Nation Mourns.' The vocal duet 'Fairy Bowers,' by the Misses H. Rogers and E. Spears, was also creditable and worthy of mention in this place. 'The Play,' however, was the thing, which if it did not 'catch the conscience of the King,' certainly charmed the ears and hearts of the audience. It was written by a lady belonging to the house, and exceedingly well written. Infinitely higher than the mysteries of the olden time, in which churchmen took part, it was somewhat of a similar character in its structure and moral. Miss J. Wood, an exceedingly beautiful blonde, with a face like one of Raphael's Madonnas, sustained the part of Queen Blanche with dignity and talent throughout, and here and there with genuine pathos and power. Miss Sherman (the general's daughter) played Queen Margaret of France with a fine, courtly appreciation of the character, and flung into it all the grace and loveliness of her person, as well as the brilliancy of her talent. *Benice*, by Miss E. Tong, was also well done, and contrasted admirably with *Inez* (Miss E. Weld), the Tartar princess—the former representing the timid but aspiring Christian, and the latter a pagan sorceress, who is finally conquered by the living power of the holy faith. *Inez* was a very superior impersonation of a proud, powerful, wilful, and beautiful pagan, who, in her endeavors to convert her sister, is converted herself. Miss Weld played with earnestness and feeling throughout, and with a natural and graceful but too uniform an action.

"By far the best character, however, was that of *Fleda* the maniac, by Miss J. Schultz, whom nature apparently has made for a tragic actress. Miss Schultz is a young lady only twelve years of age, but her acting was an inspiration. It was without stress or strain, a perfectly legitimate and natural interpretation of an exceedingly difficult character. The world will hear more of her anon.

"A description of the buildings, grounds, grottoes, chapels, lakes, and general scenery, not forgetting the wonderful chime of bells with its perfect machinery, would not be out of place, but lack of space forbids."

We had intended to give our impressions, to a greater or less extent, of several New York female seminaries, but we now find we must defer doing so. We cannot say more, even

of the Ferris Female Institute, which we regard as one of the best on this continent, than that its last commencement exhibited many new evidences and illustrations of the superior efficiency and excellency of its system.

We have devoted much time, labor, and space to this article; but we have done so deliberately and willingly, because we believe that nothing is of greater importance than the education of those who are to succeed the present generation as the men and women of the republic; because we hold that the education of a nation is the real source of its wealth, and the only true criterion of its civilization. "L'enseignement," says M. Bastide, "est une riche mine qui donne pour produit *de l'argent, de l'influence* et *du pouvoir*." Another French writer, who has devoted his life to the cause, observes, with equal truth: "L'histoire des écoles serait l'histoire de la culture intellectuelle des nations. L'état plus ou moins florissant des écoles, leur developpement plus ou moins prospere, plus ou moins étendu, peut donner la mesure de la civilization à chaque epoque, *non seulement dans le domaine de la science, mais aussi au point de vue des mœurs, des lois* et *des institutions*."

ART. IX.—NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

HISTORY AND TRAVELS.

La Plata, étude historique. Par SANTIAGO ARCOS. Paris: Levy Frères, 1865.

IT is a singular fact, that much more attention is paid to the republics of South America, on the continent of Europe, than in this country. There are several good histories of each in French and German, but we have scarcely one that can be regarded as an authority, with the exception of Prescott's histories of the *Conquests* of Mexico and Peru, which only relate to the colonial times, and which are consequently entirely different from the French and German works to which we allude. That now before us contains a large amount of interesting and valuable information; for, although it is principally devoted to La Plata, it gives no slight insight into the affairs of Paraguay and the Argentine Republic, and we are thus aided by it, to a considerable extent, in forming an opinion of the complications now existing between one of those republics and Brazil.

After giving a graphic sketch of the Spanish conquest and its immediate results, as well as a brief, but comprehensive and truthful description of the aboriginal races, their manners, customs, and religion, M. Arcos proceeds

to show that, instead of profiting by the establishment of their independence, the people suffered the worst consequences of disorder and anarchy for a period of forty years. Nor can this statement be attributed to any prejudice against republicanism on the part of the author, since no writer is more willing to give it all the credit that is legitimately due to it. Thus, for example, he informs his readers that whatever had been the sufferings and trials of those forty years of disorder, the Argentine Republic at least is entitled to the honor of having finally succeeded in establishing a government which compares favorably with the most enlightened and liberal in the world. He shows that the people are by no means the ignorant and degraded hordes which they were formerly represented, and which they are still represented by their enemies, and by those who, while ambitious to write their history, do not take the pains to make themselves acquainted with the facts. He tells us that, on the contrary, they pay more attention to education than the people of most European states.

In addition to the large amount of information which he gives us on the political, social, and religious condition of La Plata, he presents us lively and graphic sketches of the chiefs who took part in the various struggles which, however unpromising they seemed in their progress, have finally resulted in producing a decided reform. Among the leaders who are thus prominently brought to our notice are Rosas, Quiroga, Lopez, Sarmiento and Moreno. In short, we have seldom read a book that has interested us more. Except on one point, M. Arcos is eminently fair, and free from prejudice. He is willing to do justice to all, but to the Jesuits. A member of the fraternity gave him some real or imaginary offence; he complained of this, but got no satisfaction; from this he concluded, rather illogically, that all are arrogant and despotic; and hence the gloomy picture which he draws of the career of Francia in Paraguay.

A History of the Commonwealth of Florence, from the earliest Independence of the Commune to the Fall of the Republic in 1531. By T. Adolphus Trollope, author of the "Girlhood of Catherine de Medici." In four volumes. Vols. I and II. London: Chapman & Hall, 1865.

No friend of civilization, no student of history, or of the science of government, can fail to take an interest in the subject of these volumes, for Florence has been the real modern Athens. She maintained that character by the common consent of all Europe for nearly three centuries. Even in her present degenerate state, after having borne the yoke of so many conquerors, and been more or less despoiled by each, she possesses interesting and valuable evidences of her former greatness. But if she could point to nothing more than to the statues and portraits of her three illustrious sons—Dante, Angelo, and Machiavelli—which adorn her unrivalled art-galleries, ought they not to be sufficient to attract attention to her history.

Mr. Trollope sheds much light on many events in Florentine history which have never been satisfactorily explained. No other writer

with whom we are acquainted gives so complete an exposition of the famous feud between the Guelphs and Ghibellines; and he is equally careful and lucid in dealing with the Bianchi and Neri factions. The biographical sketches with which the narrative is interspersed greatly enhance the attractiveness of the work. Thus, for example, his remarks on the exile of Dante, and its probable cause, show that he has fully investigated the subject; but the conclusion he arrives at is not that the author of the *Inferno* was a true patriot, but, on the contrary, that the bitter ingratitude he had experienced from the Republic, inspired him with an implacable hatred even of his native city.

Of the author's style we should speak in different terms, did we attempt to criticise the work; but that task we postpone until the whole is before us. We can only say now, in general terms, that while Mr. Trollope succeeds in compressing a large amount of information into his pages, and seldom fails to inspire confidence in his views, on disputed points, his language is too often far beneath the dignity of history. A history of Florence and her illustrious thinkers ought at least to be free from slang, but such we regret to find is not the case in the present instance, although we must now confine ourselves to one specimen, taken from that passage in which the influence of Italy in the race of civilization is described before her fall, the catastrophe being recorded thus: "She knocked up, and was nowhere." This is in execrable taste; but let us admit that anything so like what in America we call the Bowery style, does not occur often. Upon the whole, then, we accept the work thus far as a valuable contribution to historical literature.

Voyage de Jaques Cartier au Canada en 1534. Nouvelle édition, publiée d'après l'édition de 1598. Par M. H. MICHELANT, avec deux cartes, documents inédits sur Jacques Cartier, et le Canada, communiqués par M. Alfred Ramé. 16mo. Paris: Libraire Tross, 1865.

THE contents of this quaint and curious work should be much more interesting to Americans than to Frenchmen, since it is we whom they concern most. Cartier's plain and unvarnished account of his discoveries is given in the same orthography and the same words in which it was originally penned by the old captain, more than three centuries ago. His address to the reader, and a poem with some pretensions to merit, "Sur le voyage de Canadas," as well as the charters allowed by the king, are equally unchanged. Yet, perhaps, the most interesting part of the whole book is the author's account of the language of the aborigines. First he shows how they count, as follows: Segada, 1; Tigneny, 2; Asche, 3; Honnacon, 4, &c. Then he gives the names they apply to the different parts of the body, thus: La teste (the head), aggourzy, le front (the face), hetguenyascon, les jambes, agongrienehonde, &c. We are sure that our archæological and historical societies will be glad to have their attention called to the work; and accordingly we do not hesitate to recommend it

to them; although we are not aware that a copy of it is to be found in New York, except our own.

The Charter of Smith's Home for Aged Indigent Mothers, granted by the Legislature of Maine, March 3, 1862; *organized October* 23, 1863; *together with the Deed of a Real Estate Endowment of the Institution.* By FRANCIS O. J. SMITH; *also his Letter, explanatory of the designs of the Corporation; also, the By-Laws of the Corporation, and names of its officers, and Board of Managers*, 1865. Portland: 1865.

WE take up this pamphlet in order to present an example of the noblest generosity and benevolence to those who have the means of imitating it. Although the title indicates the nature of the good done, we will give an extract or two from the explanatory letter of the donor, premising that they deserve to be printed in gold, as doing honor to human nature. We know nothing of the circumstances of the gentleman who makes this magnificent grant; we do not know whether he has a family of his own, or whether he is a married man or a batchelor. All we know about him is, what is evident from his thoughts and his acts, namely, that he is a true philanthropist, and a man of high culture. In his Explanatory Letter to the corporators, dated Forrest Home, Westbrook (Maine), November 5, 1863. Mr. Smith says:

"GENTLEMEN—With this I deliver to you a conditional conveyance in fee simple, with warranty against incumbrance, of the real estate I have designed as the foundation of what I trust will prove an enduring and prosperous beneficent institution for a goodly number of aged indigent mothers, conjoined with the opportunity, in the conditions of my grant, for other humanely disposed donors to provide a home for many aged, indigent females, not of the preferred class of mothers.

"The building upon the premises is now in progress of rapid completion, and will be ready for occupation in the early part of next summer. The massiveness of the stone and brick walls, and fire-proof brick ceilings, rendered a second season necessary to their thorough drying, before plastering; but this has been had, and the plaster work is nearly completed, as is also much of the carpenter work. It contains twelve comfortable bed rooms in the two stories above the basement, besides a room of double the size of the others, on the first floor for a sitting room, and one of the same size in the second story for the use of the sick. In the attic are ample rooms for the servants, and in the basement is a spacious dining room, a conveniently large kitchen, wash room, bath room, store closet—and in the rear a large brick cistern, a vegetable room and apartments for fuel. Still other apartments are provided and will be alluded to below. The main building is fifty-two feet six inches by thirty-three feet, with an L, thirty-one by twenty-six feet, and iron girders throughout, with slate and tin roof, having two dormer windows on the rear side and three on the front.

"The area of ground embraced in my conveyance, conjunctively with a perpetual right to the use of adjoining streets in common with adjacent owners, will be sufficient to secure to the inmates of the institution, at all times, a pure atmosphere, and the quietude of retirement; and yet a proximity to neighbors, that will exclude all sense of loneliness."

From some observations which follow this passage we learn that the "Aged Indigent Mothers' Home" is in view of the sea, and in every other respect beautifully situated. The donor does not content himself with

merely giving aged and indigent mothers a support; he also provides for every rational enjoyment, mental and physical, of which women of their age can be supposed to be capable. He has transferred to the trustees his own library, consisting of some two or three thousand volumes, the accumulation of a man of taste and means for nearly half a century. In addition to this he allows them ample grounds for exercise and recreation in the open air, as may be seen from the following extract:

"The area of ground reserved in front of the Home, directed in my grant to be forever maintained and cultivated exclusively as pleasure and ornamental ground, while it will contribute to the pleasurable results of health and seclusion already named, will always furnish, besides, to such of them as may still cherish a fondness of early years for watching and nursing the growth of plants, flowers, and shrubbery—some of which may be associated in their minds with the most cherished memories of life—the opportunity of indulging their favorite pastime, and will contribute potently therein to the enlargement of happiness to their declining years."

There is not much likelihood that any of those New York millionaires who pretend to make such large contributions towards the payment of the national debt will endow an institution of this kind. It is not probable, for example, that "Commodore" Vanderbilt will; he who monopolizes so many of our railroads and steamships, although we can assure him that it would redound vastly more to his honor than certain other performances of his, including that of driving so many fast horses to death because they are far more spirited and generous than himself. True, the commodore, with the pious white cravat, is but one millionaire, but *ex uno disce omnes.*

EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.

Address and Poem, delivered before the Philodemic Society of Georgetown College, D. C., at the grand Annual Celebration, January 19, 1865. The Address by JAMES A. WISE; the Poem by R. ROSS PERRY. Washington, 1865.

THE faults to which young orators and writers are chiefly prone are exaggeration and an ambitious style. They are too apt to think that, however striking an idea may be in itself, it becomes mean and commonplace if clothed in plain, simple language. It is in vain that they read the contrary in their test books a hundred times, and have it lucidly explained to them as often by their professors or teachers; it is only by a careful and patient course of training—by pointing out those defects to them again and again, as they occur in their own essays that they can be taught to appreciate the difference between an inflated style and a chaste style, or between language that is vigorous and energetic and that which is flabby and weak.

When, therefore, the language of the student is found terse and pointed, it may be taken for granted, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, that he has undergone the severe discipline to which we have alluded,

especially if he exhibits good common sense in his reasoning; for there are but few, even among educators, who are capable of estimating the influence of culture on the faculty which we call by that name, although a moment's reflection would show that what teaches us to reason, and consequently to distinguish right from wrong, and truth from error, must necessarily improve our understanding. But in the present case we should regard the course of training and discipline as good though the style were inflated, the reasoning illogical, and the common sense near akin to nonsense, partly because the reputation of Georgetown College is a guarantee for thoroughness, and partly because there is a certain class of minds so like the barren heath that no amount of cultivation will fertilize them. The fact is pleasanter as it is, however; the address of Mr. Wise exhibits the qualities we have spoken of to a considerable extent, as will presently be seen, although by this we do not mean that it makes any near approach to perfection, or that there is not much room for improvement on the part of the author. It is as the effort of a student who has but recently graduated that we admire and commend it, and we do so because the most that can be expected from the best colleges in the world is to prepare the mind for the acquisition of knowledge, and render it capable of making proper use of that knowledge when acquired. The history of all great thinkers, from Pythagoras and Plato to Kepler, Newton, and Locke, proves this. Some, indeed, attain to eminence at once after they leave college, or even before they leave it, but they are so very few that they can be regarded only as exceptions. The reader will, therefore, understand us, and not think we bestow any unmerited praise, when we present the following extract from the opening of Mr. Wise's address, with the observation that there are those who have occupied for a decade the position of a public writer, who could not express themselves in more appropriate language, or compress a larger amount of enlightened thought into the same space:

"A brief glance at the history of mankind, from the earliest ages of the world, exhibits an insatiable desire of insuring to themselves a government of lasting security, whilst at the same time it reveals a restlessness under control, and a personal love of power. With a world before them—without wisdom or experience—condemned to grope blindly amidst perplexity and uncertainty, they might be truly said to have succeeded to a 'heritage of woe' when they became 'lords of themselves.' Accordingly, we find them progress slowly, but not surely; and the experience of the world presents a picture of dissatisfaction and dissension, increased in proportion to the multiplication of the human race, striving to effect the good of mankind, and the perfection of human nature, the great ends of all civil institutions, but unable to ascertain any means by which the same are secured. The patriarchal power becomes too weak for a refractory people, where reverence for age and the family tie are ineffectual checks upon the passions of a deluded multitude. The imperial seizes upon the mind, dazzles the imagination, and entwines the subject in its glossy meshes ere he is aware, frustrating the hope of personal security and happiness; and, whilst pandering to the ambition and avarice of his ruler, he but extends the sphere of his misery, by aiding to enslave others under 'universal empire.' As-

syria, Persia, Greece, and Rome flourish and decay. Still works the restless spirit of change and vague political desire. The student of political science turns almost in vain to history, when he asks for a government, the fundamental principle of which is security, lasting security. We ask almost in vain for the form of government and the set of principles that will make men for allegiance, are the only *desiderata* asked by the subject; happy, and keep them so. Protection and security, in return, but history rarely shows him where they are attainable, never where they have been lastingly conferred. Political science will teach him, as an elementary principle, that the great features of all good government are, the greatest good to the greatest number; the surrender of the least amount of personal liberty for the better preservation of the rest. But change, change, insecurity, and decay, are stamped upon every government the world has ever seen. The Norman succeeds the Saxon; and laws, customs, manners, and language itself receive the stamp of the conquerer. Again will history point us to houses that have stood for centuries—that have held the wand of power by undisputed title—swept away; a new order of things springing up: while the people are subjected to all the horrors incident to revolution and abrupt change in all those principles of their government on which they had relied for protection. It shows us dynasties falling into decay—it points us to a Cromwell uprooting hereditary power; and again it shows us hereditary power supplanting the short-lived *regime* inaugurated by Cromwell. It shows us the '*ultima ratio regum*,' too often appealed to for the happiness and prosperity of the people, the gordian knot of the right of succession cut by the sword, and it shows us a wild thirst for power, sacrificing the best interests of a helpless people on the altars of unholy ambition."

Not many of our public functionaries, who occupy high positions in virtue of certain oratorical abilities which they are supposed to possess, could express themselves more sensibly or more forcibly than this. Our young author makes some bold but just criticisms on certain tendencies in public opinion and public taste, which we should be pleased to reproduce; but our diminished space will only permit us to observe, in general terms, that in our opinion he possesses an amount of intellectual power, which, if properly exercised, is capable of effecting much good.

We cannot speak in similar terms of the poem in the same pamphlet, entitled "The Ravages of Time," although, as a specimen, of easy and, generally correct, versification, it must be regarded as a clever performance for a student. The difficulty is, that even Georgetown College cannot make a poet when nature has forgotten to supply the germ. Not but there are good thoughts happily and vigorously expressed in these stanzas—nay more, there are those who would be highly offended if it were alleged that they do not possess the true poetic spirit, in whose published works there are not many better lines than these:

"O dark, mysterious time! what tongue can tell
Thy natal hour? When shall thy funeral knell
Be rung by spectres grim?
Creation's dawn beheld thee in thy birth;
Dissolving nature and the quaking earth
Shall chant thy requiem hymn.

"The ravages of time! how sad the word,—
The churchyard, where our brightest hopes interred,
Tell of a mortal race.
In Time's vast sepulchre the brooding cares
Which hover 'round us here, our frenzied fears,
All find a resting-place."

This is earnest and solemn; still it is but honest prose in the form of poetry. That it gives evidence of a high degree of culture, and a thoughtful, philosophic turn of mind, far be it from us to deny. But this is not sufficient; we should perhaps omit to say so, however, were we not of opinion that there is no commodity less useful than indifferent poetry. We would, therefore, advise the author rather to cultivate prose, at least rest yet awhile, availing himself of the precept of Boileau, as he well may without going beyond his professors:

"Faites choix d'un *censeur solide et salutaire*
Que *la raison conduise et le savoir éclaire.*"

Époques Antediluvienne et Celtique au Poitou. Par A. Brouillet et A. Meillet. 8vo. Poitiers: Girardin. Paris: Dumoulin, 1865.

Had a work like this, one giving the antediluvian history of the Celtic race, been written by Irishmen, what an amount of ridicule they would have elicited from a certain class of critics! But here are two scientific men of eminence, that are also favorably known in the literary world, who are not afraid to risk their reputation in either field, by tracing their ancestors back to the time of Noah. If the results of their labors are not sufficient to convince the skeptical they are at least interesting, and form a valuable contribution both to ethnology and geology. Accurate drawings are given of articles found by the authors, and which they think were in use so long ago as 24,000 years; the most remarkable of these are implements of various forms bearing the figures of animals no longer extant. On other articles are found alphabetical characters, which, in the opinion of the authors, are identical with those of the ancient Sanscrit, for which the Hindoos claim an antiquity equally remote. The authors not only maintain that there have been several deluges, but undertake to point out the exact periods at which some of them occurred. It is not necessary that we should accept all this as true before we admit that Messrs. Brouillet and Meillet are entitled to much credit for their extensive and careful researches, although their work must be seen even by those most willing to believe that it is an instructive and interesting work, before they believe that it is of so much importance as it is.

Reise durch Belgien nach Paris und Burgund. Von Dr. Ernst Förster. Leipzic, 1865.

This volume is modest, both in size and pretensions, but the lovers of art will find much in it that is at once instructive and entertaining. As the title implies, the author takes a trip to Paris *via* Belgium and Burgundy, his chief object being to make a complete study of Van der Weyden's Last Judgment, in the Hospital of St. Anthony, at Beaune. Dr. Förster is as well known throughout Germany, as an art-critic, as Ruskin is in England; but the views of the former are much more reliable, and exhibit far higher culture, and a more matured taste than those of the latter; although his English rival is a more attractive writer and a more

convincing reasoner. But there is not one of Mr. Ruskin's books that contains so many sound precepts or valuable suggestions as this. The Doctor's sketch of the life of Memling is an instructive and interesting study by itself, and its value is not a little enhanced by the account of the origin of oil painting with which it is accompanied.

Probably the chief attraction of the volume, however, consists in the elaborate description which it gives of the recent alterations in the great Art Museum of the Louvre, and of the important additions that have been made to it within the last seven years. This suggests to the critic some remarks on the compilation of catalogues for art galleries which those of our amateurs, who aspire to manage such institutions, when they make their annual exhibitions, would do well to study.

BELLES-LETTRES.

Essays in Criticism. By MATTHEW ARNOLD, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 12mo, pp. 506. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1865.

IT is pleasant to see those succeed who always exhibit taste, discrimination, and enterprise as public caterers. Of none can this be said more emphatically than of the publishers of this volume; it afforded us much gratification, therefore, during a recent visit to the modern Athens, to find those gentlemen occupying one of the most elegant and tasteful buildings in the most classic part of the city, in the immediate vicinity of one of the finest public parks in this country. As the Messrs. Ticknor & Fields have had the edifice built expressly to suit the various departments of their constantly increasing business, it is almost needless to say that it lacks no convenience which taste or skill could suggest. Were this the place to describe even what may be called an intellectual temple, there is no one which we would sketch with more pleasure; as it is, let it suffice to remark in passing that the arrangement throughout is truly admirable. The multifarious publications of the house are finely classified, and the different elegant styles of binding which Ticknor & Fields have been the first to introduce into this country, and which are the best specimens the American trade can boast of, contrast gaily and attractively with each other.

Although these remarks have no bearing on the volume before us, we do not think they are altogether inappropriate as an introduction to our impressions of a work so liberal and cosmopolitan in spirit—one whose obvious design is to do justice to foreigners as well as to natives, to Jew as well as Gentile, holding merit to be the only rightful claim to the language of approbation, and allowing no immunity to error, let it come from whence it may; no matter in what guise it may appear. It may be said

that we are not entirely free from prejudice in speaking of Professor Arnold,s book, because it will be seen that some of his most prominent views are such as we have ourselves earnestly sought to inculcate from time to time in these pages. This we can easily show if the reader will only exercise his memory a little. Indeed, little more is required on our part than to mention some of those views of the author on which he himself lays most stress, and which, in our opinion, deserve that distinction. Thus, the subject of his first article is "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time;" in this he shows the great defects of the existing mode of criticism in England, his remarks applying to American criticism with at least equal force. He shows that criticism in England is either sectarian or political, and consequently that it is impossible for it to be impartial. The following passage from his remarks is as truthful as it is bold and manly:

"For what is at present the bane of criticism in this country? It is that practical considerations cling to it and stifle it; it subserves interests not its own; our organs of criticism are *organs of men and parties* having practical ends to serve, and with them those practical ends are the first thing, and the play of mind the second; so much play of mind as is compatible with the prosecution of those practical ends is all that is wanted. An organ like the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, having for its main function to understand and utter the best that is known and thought in the world, existing, it may be said, as just an organ for a free play of the mind, *we have not;* but we have the *Edinburgh Review*, existing as an organ of the old whigs, and for as much play of mind as may suit its being that; we have the *Quarterly Review*, existing as an organ of the tories, and for as much play of mind as may suit its being that; we have the *British Quarterly Review*, existing as an organ of the political dissenters, and for as much play of mind as may suit its being that; we have the *Times*, existing as as organ of the common, satisfied, well-to-do Englishman, and for as much play of mind as may suit its being that. And so on through all the various fractions, political and religious, of our society; every fraction has, as such, its organ of criticism, but the notion of combining all fractions in the common pleasure of a free, disinterested play of mind meets with no favor."—p. 18.

An ordinary English writer or thinker is sure to speak of anything French, in comparison with anything English, as "Frenchy," "Gallic," &c.; nor does anything German fare better in similar circumstances. English or American writers are, however, not peculiar in this. The writers of all countries possessed of an equal amount of intelligence—or rather the writers whose minds are equally narrow, who know little beyond their own circle—are equally contemptuous in their comparative estimates of their neighbors. Knowledge and reflection are the only remedies against that weakness. But our author proceeds to show that the proverbial arrogance for which we blame our English cousins is produced by their politicians and sectaries. As an instance, he quotes language like the following, from an address by Mr. Adderley to the farmers of Warwickshire: "Talk of the improvement of breed! Why, the race we ourselves represent, the men and women, *the old Anglo-Saxon race, are the best breed in the whole world.*" (p. 20) A similar quotation is given from a speech

by Mr. Roebuck to the Sheffield cutlers; then the author tells us how, after reading both specimens of braggadocia, he meets with the following paragraph in an English paper:

"A shocking child-murder has just been committed at Nottingham. A girl named Wragg left the workhouse there on Saturday morning with her young illegitimate child. The child was soon afterwards found dead on Mapperly Hills, having been strangled. Wragg is in custody."—p. 21.

In commenting on this, he remarks: "How suggestive are those few lines: 'Our old Anglo-Saxon breed, the best in the whole world!'—how much that is harsh and ill-favored there is in this best! *Wragg!*" Further on he says: "In Ionia and Attica they were luckier in this respect than 'the best race in the world;' by the Ilissus there was no Wragg, poor thing! And 'our unrivalled happiness,'—what an element of grimness, bareness, and hideousness mixes with it and blurs it; the *workhouse*, the dismal Mapperly Hills—how dismal those who have seen them will remember—the gloom, the smoke, the cold, the strangled illegitimate child! * * * The sex lost in the confusion of our unrivalled happiness; or shall I say the superfluous Christian name lopped off by the straightforward vigor of our old Anglo Saxon breed!"—(p. 22.)

Now be it remembered that he is no foreigner who speaks in this style but one of the most distinguished professors at Oxford. After having rendered it obvious to the most thoughtless, how foolish and pernicious this national boasting is, he proceeds to show what incalculable good, true, legitimate criticism is capable of doing; but he takes care to explain that it will be neither true nor legitimate as long as it is merely local; that, in short, English critics must be as independent and cosmopolitan as the continental critics before they can expect to do much good:

"But, after all, the criticism I am really concerned with—the criticism which alone can much help us for the future, the criticism which, through out Europe, is at the present day meant, when so much stress is laid on the importance of criticism and the critical spirit—is a criticism which regards Europe as being, *for intellectual and spiritual purposes*, one great confederation, bound to a joint action and *working to a common result*, and whose members have, *for their proper outfit, a knowledge of Greek, Roman, and Eastern antiquity, and of one another*. Special, local, and temporary advantages being put out of account, that modern nation *will, in the intellectual and spiritual sphere, make most progress which most thoroughly carries out this programme*."—pp. 36, 37.

This is true philosophy; the best evidence of an enlightened and liberal mind. But the whole article must be read in order to be appreciated. How well it becomes a professor of one of the two famous and venerable English universities to proclaim to his countrymen that the French Academy is a model which England would do well to imitate if she could! for this is the predominant idea in the very interesting and instructive article entitled "The Literary Influence of Academies." The author pays Richelieu, the illustrious founder of the Academy, the high tribute which he deserves from every true friend of science, literature,

or intellectual progress. Having shown what a powerful and valuable influence the Academy has exercised not only on the thinkers of France, but on those of all Europe, illustrating his views by many brilliant and suggestive observations, he concludes by warning his readers once more against that most characteristic weakness of the Anglo-Saxon race which leads it to imagine that it surpasses all other races in all things:

"But then every one amongst us, with any turn for literature, will do well to remember to what shortcomings and excesses, which such an academy tends to correct, we are liable; and the more liable, of course, for not having it. He will do well constantly to try himself in respect of these, steadily to widen his culture, severely to check in himself the provincial spirit; and he will do this the better the more he keeps in mind that all *mere glorification by ourselves of ourselves or our literature*, in the strain of what, at the beginning of these remarks, I quoted from Lord Macaulay, is both *vulgar*, and, besides being vulgar, retarding."—p. 72.

Now, we may ask our readers how often have we urged views of this kind during the last five years? We would have continued to do so had Professor Arnold never spoken, because we believe they are just; but we are not the less glad on this account to find that our author advocates them so boldly. We have yet only glanced at two of his papers; there are twelve in the book; and the remaining ten are, on an average, at least as good as these two. To many the majority will be much more interesting; if, indeed, they be not so to all, especially those papers on Heine, Spinoza, Joubert, and Maurice de Guérin. To the classical student, the most attractive, if not the most useful, will be the two chapters on translating Homer. It is a pity that Lord Derby did not see these before he ventured to publish his translation; and yet we have some reason to doubt whether our author himself could have given us a good version of the Iliad had he acted on the advice, which he says he has often received from his friends, to undertake that task. The titles we have mentioned show that Professor Arnold takes a wide scope; but he adverts to many topics which none would expect under such heads. Thus, for example, he makes some rather sharp and not very complimentary criticisms on the United States in the paper entitled a "French Eton." We make room for one extract, which must be the last:

"But why do they refuse to perceive, that, apart from all class-jealousy of aristocracies towards a democratic republic, there existed in the most impartial and thoughtful minds a profound dissatisfaction with the spirit and tendencies of the old American Union, a strong aversion to their unchecked triumph, a sincere wish for the disciplining and correcting of them? And what were the old United States but a colossal expression of the English *middle-class spirit*, somewhat more accessible to ideas there than here, because of the democratic air it breathed; *much more arrogant and overweening there than here*, because of the absence of all check and counterpoise to it,—but there, as here, full of *rawness, hardness*, and *imperfection;* there, as here, greatly needing to be liberalized, enlarged, and ennobled, before it could with advantage be suffered to assert itself absolutely? All the energy and success in the world could not have made the United States admirable so long as their spirit had this imperfection. Even if they had

overrun the whole earth, their old national style would have still been detestable, and Mr. Beecher would have still been a heated barbarian."—p. 498.

It is not pleasant to have the tone of American society so recently as before the rebellion compared to "the English middle-class spirit;" still less pleasant is it to be styled "arrogant and overweening," and then accused of "rawness, hardness, and imperfection," not to mention his regarding our great Beecher as "a heated barbarian." It is but too evident that our author has not as high an opinion of the latter gentleman as himself and many of his friends have. It might have been different, however, had he heard some of his classic jokes in the pulpit of Plymouth Church some fine Sabbath morning, after the pews in that sacred edifice brought an unusually high price at auction.. At all events, we must not blame him, since he is equally free and unceremonious in dealing with the Beechers of England, whom he is ill-natured enough to regard not as divines, but as fourth-rate politicians, whose teachings have a tendency to vitiate the public taste.

Sybil: A Tragedy in Five Acts. By JOHN SAVAGE. 12mo., pp. 105. New York: James B. Kirker, 1865.

WE find a new edition of this drama on our table as we are preparing to go to press; and we think it has sufficient merit to justify us in glancing at it even at so unseasonable a time. We believe it has been well received on the stage in all our principal cities; although we confess we have never seen it represented; indeed never read it until the present hour. Our first wish, on perusing it so far as to make ourselves familiar with the plot, was that the author had chosen a better subject; which would have been vain had he not impressed us strongly. Yet we were so much dissatisfied with the first act, with its matter, its style, and what may be called its morals, or rather its want of morals, that more than once we were almost provoked to throw the book aside. We thought that much was not to be expected from a five-act tragedy which opens as follows:

"*Wolfe.* Our new member is not stirring yet.

1*st Gent.* No—thanks to your sleight of hand last night. I should not be surprised if he didn't stir for a month.

2*d Gent.* I never saw a jollier initiation!

Bar. He may not be so jolly when he's sober.

Wolfe. Oh, he won't remember his assaults on our friend Lowe: eh, Cardinal?

Lowe. But I'll take care he shall.

Wolfe. He's young and inexperienced; and the deeds of wine evaporate with its effects.

Bar. I never saw a wilder fellow in his cups."

Nor do we think even now that this is a suitable introduction, but the reverse. We are only surprised that an author who displays such good taste, and such power of language, in each of the other four acts,

should have commenced in a manner so ill calculated to prepossess either the auditor or the reader. But no sooner does he commence the second act than he proceeds to prove, without any effort, that he is capable of awakening very different emotions. His thoughts flow rapidly, yet so vigorously and happily are they expressed that they make a deep and lasting impression. It was on feeling this that we expressed the wish alluded to. Still we admit that he had a perfect right to select the subject he has, since the strictest rules, even of the Stagyrite, allow the poet to illustrate, and even adopt, whatever views are sustained by public opinion among the people for whom he writes. Thus, if he were writing a drama for the Mahomedans, it would be perfectly right for him, in a poetical sense, to regard polygamy as a pious and good, if not a divine, institution; and if he were writing for a Hindoo audience, there would be the utmost propriety in making his catastrophe consist of the immolation of an inconsolable widow to the manes of her husband. If polygamy or self-immolation is wrong in itself, the poet is no more to blame for it than Homer is for the quarrels of Jupiter with his divine spouse, Juno, or for the misconduct of any of the minor gods or goddesses; since his chief business is to portray the manners of the time, to imitate on the stage what is done in real life. Then, as it is notorious that, if a young lady, or even an old lady, in this country, is seduced, she may make a heroine of herself by shooting or stabbing her seducer, or by employing a second or third lover to do so for her, it must be admitted that Mr. Savage has a perfect right to portray such a character as Sybil, the heroine of the present tragedy; although the tendency of his doing so is clearly to encourage delicate women to commit the most indelicate and most cruel acts. But before we make any further comments, let us see how our heroine conducts herself. The first scene in the first act discovers her in a wood practising with a pistol at a target, in order that she may possess sufficient skill to assassinate her seducer:

Sybil. Thank Heaven, I fail not; each unerring shot
Is certain intimation of revenge,
And daily gives me courage to live on. (*Moves.*)
Without this all-sustaining, grateful hope,
The solitude I breathe were death: and death
That might have been a heav'nly gift, ere fled
My happy childhood trembling from my heart
(As though affrighted by its haughty blood),
Would now be that most unforgiving curse
This wilful, woful, wretched brain could bear.
Five years, like monumental marbles rise
Above my girlish beauty, and record
The gnawing consciousness of coarse deceit,
The bitter anguish of defrauded hopes,
Mocked aims; the loss of name, position, love;
The loss of all those dear amenities
That should have been the guerdon and the guide,
The life itself of the proud, withered youth beneath. (*Weeps.*)

These are fine thoughts. There is true poetry in them; but they rest on a dangerous basis. In any case revenge is unchristian; it is particularly unworthy of woman; but we are only at the beginning of its development in the present case. As we proceed, we are reminded of the sentiment put by Voltaire into the mouth of Zaire, in his celebrated tragedy of that name:

> "Je vois avec mépris ces *maximes terribles*,
> Luifont de tant de rois des tyrans invisibles."

The following is a very fine passage; we remember nothing of the kind so replete with the spirit of cold calculating vengeance, and yet so pathetic, save a somewhat similar scene in Otway's "Venice Preserved." We do injustice to the author by giving only a fragment, but our limited space in this department does not admit any more:

> "*Sybil (rising).* Why do I weep? Have I not said the word
> That should dry up those fountains of the eye
> Which are the tender emblems of affection!
> Tears! What right have I with tears? I, whose lone hope
> Feeds on sparks that iron destiny
> Strikes from the heart that's hardened into flint.
> O woman! image of all feebleness
> Art thou. These garments are its badges. How long
> Must I still crave for retribution?
> A day, an hour would have given to a man
> That prompt revenge which I have sought for years.
> (*Muses.*) Fool that I was to have denied his suit.
> Why did I not at least accept his *hand*—
> The hand of man! He is an avenger
> Sent from heaven, and I have cast him off.
> What is love, life, or fear, or joy to me,
> That I should weigh distinctions?
> What is his love to me, that I should fear
> To use it for my hate? He still is mine
> If I but say it; and not to say it,
> Is to fling away the weapon heaven sent.
> I cannot doubt his love! His love—ha! ha! ha!
> Man's love! that brilliant shroud for infamy.
> (*Pauses.*) Eustace Clifden, thou art mine; I take thy hand
> And place within it all my woes, my wrongs,
> My pent-up, silent-growing rage of years.
> I take thy hand as Judith took the sword
> That freed her from the libertine.
> Oh, how near losing, by a word, was I,
> The means of making vengeance perfect.
> Yet while I plan, perchance he flies the place,
> And leaveth nothing but his heart behind.
> I claim his hand—his *hand* is *all* I need."—pp. 52, 53.

This does not breathe much tenderness for the new lover, but rather shows that she only wants to use him to gratify her passion for revenge. Nor is this strange or inconsistent, but on the contrary, since she who would murder one lover would be likely to murder another quite as

readily if he disappointed her in a similar manner. But would the murder of either add to her virtue, or would it repair her virtue if it were injured? Would any person capable of distinguishing right from wrong respect her more because she assassinates her seducer than if she had pursued the more modest and more womanly course of seeking to hide her misfortune from the world? It is a precept of the wisest of mankind that frequent opportunities and importunities will overcome the greatest virtue. If this be true, it follows that a woman may be seduced and still be virtuous. At worst, the fault is one of nature; but it is only the lower animals that naturally betake themselves to mutual slaughter; but even among the carnivorous kind, including the bloodthirsty panther it is not natural for the female to waylay the male and tear out his heart, while, perhaps, he expects rather to be caressed than butchered! It is vastly better for her own sake—vastly more conducive to the cause of virtue—to inculcate on woman that, if she errs, she must bear the consequences of it; that, if she wants redress for any wrong done her, she should rather appeal to the laws of her country, like an orderly citizen, than take them into her own hands and violate them, like a disorderly one.

If such is her disposition, however, that is, if she is lost to the mild and generous impulses of her sex, then she should be addressed in the language which the greatest of the Greek tragic poets puts into the mouth of Orestes in addressing his own mother:

> "And since thou kill'dst the man thou should'st have spared,
> *The man that now should spare thee can but kill.*"

But we must give another extract or two from the *Sybil* before we close. The heroine admits to Clifden, her second lover, in the third scene of the third act, that her hand had been wooed and won by another

> "With bright audacity and subtle force," &c

Then she goes to the book-case for her pistol and continues:

> "*Sybil.* Daily, for five long years, I've practised with
> This instrument of death. Here, in these woods,
> I've daily held a calm devotion, where
> Hate is the deity and vengeance dark
> The officiating votaress. Love yet!—ha!
> For years I've toiled with this delusive dream—
> Retribution! But what can woman do—
> Where seek—how find her victim? Ah, think you,
> Eustace Clifden, could I have met my foe,
> I would divide the glory of this work
> Of gnawing vengeance! No! this eye and hand
> Are strangers to a woman's fears."

This is not womanly, although, as we have said, the poet has a

right to reproduce what passes in real life, however wrong or pernicious it is. But if it be true that men, far from being prevented from accepting a woman's hand by the knowledge of her dishonor, are only prompted to seize it the more eagerly, then it would follow that the loss sustained is not very great after all—at least, not so great as to render it worth while to commit murder for it. But let us hear what passes between the new lovers:

"*Sybil.* Stay—be warned—
Never was man to such conditions brought,
As you to those by which you claim my love.
Clif. Hear me, thou just impartial heaven!
To stand between this woman and her wrongs—
To take her heart and shrive it of its hate,
To make her woes my own—
Sybil. Do not mock me,
The barrier cannot, must not be o'erstepped.
Clif. I swear by this fair hand—
Sybil. Swear not, and be free:
The hand you clasp is a dishonored hand!
Clifden (*recoils and drops her hand*).
Sybil (*with calm passion*). Who takes my hand must take the weapon from it.
My husband must avenge his wife's dishonor.
Clif. (*clasping her hand.*) Thy hand, thy hate is mine.
Sybil. The oath.
Clif. I swear.
(*Sybil, overcome, hysterically falls into Clifden's arms.*)"

The man who is thus doomed is, of course, a fiend, a monster, a vile miscreant, whereas he might have been a very good sort of person had he married the lady, or *could* he have married her. Whether the matter was beyond his control or not, die he must; and it is not only a pardonable, but a meritorious thing to cut his throat or perforate his heart whenever an opportunity offers. Sybil relents a little, however, in the fourth act, for she addresses her lord and vindicator as follows, wishing to revoke his oath:

"For the dear sake of that new-born blessing
Your love has given my nature, hear me."

These little compunctions do not last long, however, for on the very next page we find her urging him as follows:

"Better he should die
Better we should all die!
Strike him Clifden—
Strike and fear nothing! Husband, strike deep—
Strike to his very heart! Strike! Strike! Strike!"
(*Falls, overcome.*)

Nor does she feel any remorse when he is dead; but, on the contrary, she triumphs in the deed, because she has little doubt that her husband

will be acquitted when she has had time to display her charms and bring to bear

"The fact's full force upon the jury's ear."

It is almost superfluous to say that she was entirely right in her faith in the jury, although she addresses one of that honorable body as ollows:

"You smile to think
She needs protection;—*Fool!* all women do.
You will not speak to me—go to, *coward*,
And you, thou *low-browed homily* on man."

There is no doubt but the portraiture of our heroine is a truthful one; so is that of her husband, the very gallant person who had not brains enough to get a wife without imbruing his hands in the blood of his neighbor; but neither is truer to nature than the sketch which we are presented of the jury that so readily acquitted the assassin. Still we think that the forte of Mr. Savage does not lie in making assassins of gentle women; there are several of his poems in "Faith and Fancy," any of which possesses more genuine merit than *Sybil*, as we may take occasion to prove in a future number, but without any attempt to deny that the drama thus hurriedly glanced at entitles the author to high rank as a dramatist.

The Poetry of the Orient. By WILLIAM ROUNSEVILLE ALGER. 16mo. pp. 337. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1865.

THERE is much that is curious, interesting, and beautiful in this little volume; but it is very awkwardly arranged. This is all the more to be regretted because the book is clearly and neatly printed on fine paper, and tastefully bound. With a little care, the reader will, of course, be able to find all; but from its peculiar character an index would have greatly enhanced the value of the work. Instead of an index, however, the editor has given us an exceedingly clumsy and imperfect table of contents; and such as the latter is, it is devoted almost exclusively to the topics which occur in his own Introduction. Thus the "contents" fill two pages, but only *three lines* refer to the body of the work; the difference being, that while the introduction, with its copious extracts, extends only to ninety-two pages, the remaining matter occupies two hundred and forty-five pages.

True, in one sense this is an advantage, for the reader will meet with many a gem in his explorations to which there is not the slightest allusion in the table of contents. It is, indeed, better that we should be obliged to search in this way than to be led to expect what is not to be found, by either misrepresentation or exaggeration. If the book were but one of the inanities which are most common at the present day, we should not care whether it had an index or table of contents, but think it was well if it had neither; but when we know that the larder is

unusually rich and varied, we decidedly prefer to have a bill of fare, so that we may be able to gratify our taste at once with just the dish we want.

We have, however, no further fault to find with Mr. Alger. In his introduction he gives an interesting sketch of the progress made in recent years in enabling the matter-of-fact and logical West to avail itself of the literature of the imaginative and dreamy East, treating us to a delicious sample here and there of the works of some of the best Oriental poets. As far as his researches have extended, he has made judicious selections; but he has confined himself too exclusively to English and German sources, and generally to such versions as are to be found in periodicals. We do not mean that the latter are less valuable than other versions or selections, for such is not the fact; but a compiler of a work of this kind should always aim at freshness as much as possible, and try to present his reader something they have not previously seen, rather than what they are familiar with from other sources, even though the latter should have more merit than the former. We should not blame Mr. Alger for having overlooked so many fine French versions of the masterpieces of the East had he not informed us that the French language is one of those in which Oriental literature has been accessible to him; and also told us that his habit has been to translate into English whatever favorite specimen he happened to meet in any of the European languages with which he is acquainted, for he does not pretend to understand any Eastern tongue.

We will now give a few specimens from Mr. Alger's selections, but shall be guided more in doing so by peculiarity of thought or sentiment, than poetical merit, since the elements of poetry are everywhere the same. Among no Christian people is the necessity of forgiving even our enemies more strongly inculcated than it is both in Persia and Arabia. Precepts like the following are to be found in a hundred forms throughout the East:

> "Learn from yon Orient shell to love thy foe,
> And store with pearls the hand that brings thee woe:
> Free, like yon rock, from base, vindictive pride
> Imblaze with gems the wrist that tears thy side."

The thoughts contained in the following lines apply with quite as much force to the West as they do to the East; but we do not remember to have met with them in so striking a form in any European or American poet as that in which they are here presented:

> "What is the good man and the wise?
> Ofttimes a pearl which none doth prize;
> Or jewel rare, which men account
> A common pebble and despise.
> Set forth upon the world's bazaar,
> It mildly gleams, but no one buys," &c.—p. 17.

All who have paid any attention to the literature of the East are more or less familiar with the character of Firdousi, the Persian Homer and author of the famous Shâh Nâmeh; but his satire on the upstart king who failed to reward him as he had promised for his labor, and added insult to injury, is not so well known in the West, although a more trenchant or withering invective has scarcely ever been penned by an indignant member of the *genus irritabile*. We transcribe one stanza from the five given by Mr. Alger:

"Place thou within the spicy nest,
Where the bright phœnix loves to rest,
A raven's egg, and mark thou well,
When the vile bird has chipped his shell;
Though fed with grain from trees that grow
Where Salsebil's pure waters flow;
Though airs from Gabriel's wing may rise
To fan the cradle where he lies,
Though long their patient cares endure,
He proves at last a bird impure."—p. 56.

The Sufis are as much celebrated for their stoical virtue and piety as they are for their strange mysticism. The way of one of their poets of saying "Get thee behind me, Satan," is:

"Turn thou thine eyes from each seducing sight,
For looking whets the ready edge of appetite."

Of a different character is the following, and a better advice could not be given by all the divines that ever preached:

"Seek wisdom while on earth, as if you were immortal there;
But virtue, as if death already had you by the hair!"

We had marked many other passages, each of which is remarkable for merit of some kind; but these the reader will have to discover for himself; we have already given more specimens than the claims of other books lying on our table would justify. We can only add that, if, in getting out a new edition, the editor would examine the French versions a little more carefully than he has yet done, culling a gem from them here and there, and then prepare a careful index of the whole, that large and growing class of his countrymen who have a taste for poetry would amply reward him for his pains.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of New York. Albany, 1865.

When going to press with our last number, the Superintendent did us the courtesy of sending us as much of the proof sheets of this report as

were then ready; nor did we neglect to note such of his suggestions as seemed to us ought to be generally known and acted upon. There still remains much that is important locked up in his report. We cheerfully bear testimony to the marked improvement which every succeeding annual volume exhibits, and we regard it as a clear proof that he devotes no slight amount of thought and study to the duties of his office. We confess we shall not be entirely satisfied with him, however, until he criticises more than he has hitherto done; we would have him remember for the public benefit the fable of the good-natured paterfamilias who, when he caught a boy in one of his trees stealing apples, first told him to come down in a very gentle, polite manner, and then, when disobeyed, began to throw tufts of grass, until the young scamp began to laugh at his simplicity. Finally the good man tried what virtue there was in stones, and there was no more laughing but an exhibition of a different kind.

Mr. Barnes, too, will have to throw stones, or use the lancet instead of the salve, if he wishes to produce any salutary effect on our insurance swindlers, so as to protect the public from their machinations; and at the same time do justice to those underwriters who want to take no advantage of any one, but are always ready with their checks when the property, or the life they have insured has passed through the conditions that render them liable. That the superintendent has exhibited considerable improvement in this respect, too, far be it from us to deny. In his earlier reports he spoke of our insurance companies as a very tender patriot would of the government of his choice, which, in his eyes at least, had become venerable in its efforts to afford "the largest liberty to the largest number;" but now he acts more like a citizen, *not* subject, who while still loyal begins to think that, after all, the sovereign does not govern by the divine right to which he lays claim, and consequently that some little fault may be found, now and then, with some of his satraps, if not with himself, especially when those functionaries are caught in the act of picking the pockets of their neighbors.

But this is not sufficient. Let the superintendent speak out boldly, name the thief in plain English, without using any needless metaphor, for notwithstanding the great utility of our common schools, there are but few of our people who understand figurative language in any other sense than when the figures relate to the arithmetic of dollars and cents. The celebrated and amiable Fontinelle says that there is no better way to produce a reform than to propose a great many questions which will sometimes seem highly impertinent. We think that if our insurance superintendents, commissioners, &c., would pursue this course insurance companies would not multiply half as fast as they do, and that so large a proportion of the new corporations would not be so much like those numerous petroleum companies which had millions of capital only six months ago, together with inexhaustible oil wells capable of enriching all

who invested their money in them, but which have now neither capital nor wells.

We suppose we need hardly say that we do not mean that all new companies are unreliable; there are several which are entitled to as much confidence as the oldest. Thus, for example, if we had any doubt of the resources of the Morris Fire and Inland Insurance Company it would be readily removed by the report of the commissioners appointed by the superintendent, as required by law, to examine its capital, securities, &c.; which report is printed in full in the volume before us. The commissioners are Chas. E. Whitehead, A. W. Bradford, and F. S. Winston; these gentlemen "certify and report *under oath*," "that the sum of two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000), the capital of said company, *has been paid in, and is now possessed by the said company, in money*, as required by the eighth section," &c., &c. But be it remembered that this report was made in September, 1864, and that the paid in cash capital amounts now to nearly if not quite $900,000.

We spoke of the International Insurance Company when it was first started, more than a year ago, as likely to prove a permanent and successful institution; and its operations to the present time fully justify that prediction. Its capital is now over a million, and it has recently secured a charter which empowers it to write marine as well as fire risks. It is now regarded as too close a neighbor to the Metropolitan Fire and Marine, which, we are sorry to learn, has fared rather unfortunately during the late war. We do not pretend to be always right in our opinions, but we thought it was not judicious for the president of the Metropolitan to have discarded his military title just at the time when even the name of a militia "Brigadier-General" exercised great influence. We are informed that the gentleman is now about to resume that title, but we fear that some will be ill-natured enough to attribute the change ("as you were") to the wrong motive. In our opinion, it would have been a better plan to offer to go to the war at once as soon as certain contingencies happened, but forget to do so when the critical moment arrived; although the only evidence we have of the fact, is, that if our memory is correct, this was the course pursued by the worthy vice-president of the Atlantic, who, we are told, has been doing a very good business since.

In speaking of marine affairs, in this part of Wall street, we are reminded of underwriters who have recourse to no stratagems in order to secure the support of intelligent business men. It is hardly necessary for us to mention whom we mean, or to say that we do not mean the insurers of the Sun, since none make a louder outcry than they, under pretence of saving their country. We mean very different men, the officers of the Mercantile Mutual, who have no ambition to make political speeches, or to be regarded as military chieftains; but who, like their equally unostentatious neighbors, of the Columbian Marine, hand out their check with a

good grace as soon as they ascertain that the insured vessel has really been wrecked.

The Croton Fire is still in a struggling condition; we would suggest o the president that if he could get its life insured for seven years it would be the wisest sort of underwriting he has yet done. He would also do well to take a lesson in the art of making dividends from his sagacious neighbors of the Washington Fire. A few hints from the Hope, too, would be worth going another block or two for; and Mr. Reese is a benevolent gentleman who would help even his enemy out of the ditch, if so blind that he could not grope his own way.

Life insurance is becoming more and more popular, as it well deserve to be, when legitimately conducted; but the public cannot understand too well that it is not those companies that make the loudest pretensions and use the largest figures on paper that are readiest with their checks at the critical moment. Thus, for example, there are half a dozen companies whose policies we should much rather have than that of the Mutual, although Mr. Winston is a very pious man, one of the most active members of the great Society for sending the Bible to the heathen. We do not know that the president of the New York Life ever sings a psalm; we are pretty certain that he rarely, if ever, attends political or sectarian meetings for the purpose of showing off, for the simple reason that he is always at his post; and yet we should much rather have his policy for $10,000, than that of the oratorical, pious president for $20,000.

How remarkable it is that it is those of our insurance people who can speak least to any purpose that are most anxious to display their eloquence, and *vice versa!* Those who can speak eloquently and with effect have the good sense to bear in mind that in becoming underwriters they are expected not to be talkers, but doers. Thus, for example, there is not one of the fraternity who knows how to hold his tongue better than the president of the Equitable Life, who has not only been a senator in a neigboring State, but also President of the senate, having won both positions by his eloquence. We will give one other instance: What underwriter in America has less to say, or makes less noise than the president of the New England Mutual Life?—a gentleman who has been brought up to the bar, and whose oratorical and legal talents secured him a seat on the bench. He regards the duties of a life underwriter as still more important, and more useful when faithfully discharged, than even those of a judge; he attends to them accordingly, and the triumphant result is notorious, for no other company anywhere has a higher prestige at this moment, or one better deserved, than his.

There is not one of our life companies which is making better progress in well-doing than the Knickerbocker. Much of this success is due to its judicious selection of agents; such as Mr. Nichols at Baltimore, and Mr. Johnson at Chicago. If all life underwriters would bear in mind, like the

President of the Knickerbocker, that in order to be efficient in the business of life insurance, the distant agent, as well as the home officer, should not only be an educated man, but one possessed of considerable talent, they would find it the cheapest plan in the long run, although expensive at the beginning.

It is the want of these qualifications, perhaps, quite as much as a scarcity of funds, that renders it necessary for the State Superintendent to speak as follows: "The North American Life Insurance Company, on the 11th day of April, 1868 (chap. 118), also procured an amendment to its charter, allowing that Corporation to insure against injury to persons while travelling. *This privilege should be repealed*, although practically it has remained a *dead letter* on the statute-book, and accident policies are not issued by the Company."* We believe the difficulty is, that very few, if any, have asked for them in that quarter; and it may be remembered that we ventured to predict as much when the "amendment" referred to was proclaimed by the Company.

Nor can we speak in much more encouraging terms now of another accident affair, entitled, "Travellers' Insurance Company of Hartford." We may be mistaken, but we should rather have our little finger safe than to have a $5,000 policy from the Hartford concern. By this we do not mean to allege that accident insurance may not prove a blessing to thousands; on the contrary, none have more faith in the principle. We have no doubt, for example, that many a family which might otherwise suffer the severest privations, will obtain substantial relief from a company like the National Life *and* Travellers' Insurance, of this city, which has the means as well as the disposition, to redeem its policies, whether on life or limb, and whose President, Mr. Edward A. Jones, is no novice who has failed in other business, but an experienced and accomplished underwriter.

As an instance of what life insurance can do, when really secured that is when obtained in the right quarter, we may mention that a lady with five children, who had just lost her husband, and had no other means of support left, recently received a check for eleven thousand dollars ($11,000) from the United States Life Insurance Company of this city, for a policy on the life of her husband, who, it seems, had been paying premiums only for three years.

La Musique et les Instruments musicales. Par JAQUES DE LEMBERT, élève du Consistoire musicale. 16mo., pp. 227. Paris: Maynoud Frères, 1865.

In this little work there is much that is interesting to all who take an interest in "the concord of sweet sounds," so much, indeed, that, had it reached us in time, we should have given an elaborate review of it. As

* Ins. Report, p. lxxxi.

it is, we must necessarily confine ourselves to a few general remarks; merely sufficient to indicate the character of the work, so that the curious may know where to find good things if they only think proper to seek them. A very interesting feature in the book is the full and generally accurate sketches which it gives of the principal instrument manufacturers of Europe.

It takes notice of only one American house; but this it ranks with the best of Europe. Since the work is edited by a musical artist who has made ample preparation for the task, it is almost superfluous to say that the one thus distinguished is that of the Messrs. Steinway & Sons, New York. He does not confine himself to merely noting the fact; among the evidences he adduces in support of it, are the medals they have received at more than one of the great European exhibitions, certain instruments imported from New York, by dealers in Berlin and Brussels, and one ordered to Mexico from the same house, by the Emperor Maxamilian, after his majesty had assisted at some performances on Steinway pianos by members of his court. Although it is no news to our readers that the instruments mentioned are the best manufactured in this country, and that they are not excelled in any country, it is nevertheless pleasant to learn that our ingenious and enterprising fellow-citizens receive abroad, as well as at home, the tribute of approbation which they so eminently deserve.

Sixth Annual Report of the Comptroller, exhibiting the Receipts and Expenditures of the County Government for the year 1864. Pamphlet, pp. 191. New York, 1865.

At first sight, this is not a very inviting document to the general reader; but on examination it proves much more interesting than its title or external appearance would lead the most sanguine to expect. That it possesses one recommendation, at all events, none will deny—namely, that of giving a lucid and straightforward account of the financial affairs of the county during the past year. There is no attempt to conceal expenses or to magnify receipts; no effort to deceive the taxpayers by spurious principles of political economy. Almost the first idea that suggests itself to us, on turning over the pages of the Report, is the large number of high-salaried functionaries with whom the county is burdened. Those who glance at these salaries will scarcely wonder that the debt of the county amounts to nearly eleven millions ($10,804,900), although, had all who received them done their duty, it would not have reached half that figure, even including the enormous claims for damages founded on the great riot of July, 1863, and amounting, according to the figures now before us, to $643,560.80.

None will deny that our District Attorney has enough to do, if he would only do it; still less will it be denied, we think, that he is pretty

well paid for his services. During the last year his office cost the city $20,000—his own personal salary amounting to $7,000—$1,500 more than that of any of the Judges of the Supreme Court; $2,000 more than that of the City Judge, and $1,000 more than that of the Recorder or the Judge of the Marine Court. If, however, he were not to allow half as many malefactors to escape as he does, because it requires too much time and labor to prosecute them earnestly and vigorously, he would be worth not only the $7,000, but considerably more. As it is, we think that his services for the past year would have been amply remunerated by $5,000; nor have we seen much sign, thus far, that he will have earned his salary for the present year much better.

The Supreme Court costs the county $62,444; the Superior Court, $71,633.32; the Court of Common Pleas, $43,700; the Marine Court, $32,700; the Surrogate's Court, $17,698.97; the Court of General Sessions, $23,400, &c. Considering the vast interests which he controls, and the great responsibility resting upon him, there is not one of our public functionaries who receives a more moderate salary than the Comptroller, the amount allowed him by the Board of Supervisors for 1864 being only $2,500. He would have deserved twice the amount had he done nothing more than to frustrate the fraudulent schemes of the gas monopolies against the city. In closing his Report he makes a suggestion which few will think uncalled for or superfluous, as follows:

"The Comptroller takes this occasion to urge upon your Honorable Body the necessity of the most rigid economy in relation to the public expenses under your control, in order to avoid a further increase of the Public Debt, and also to lessen as far as possible the burden of taxation for the current expenses of the County Government."

Another officer who receives a moderate salary, and earns a liberal one, is the County Clerk; at least this seems to be admitted on all hands as true of the gentleman who occupies that position at present. But we must forbear further comment until we see the Annual Report for the city; it is the latter which gives the large figures, and shows that there is not a city in the world which it costs so much to govern, and yet, is governed so badly, as New York.

INDEX

TO THE

ELEVENTH VOLUME

OF THE

National Quarterly Review.

Arcos, Santiago, his La Ptata noticed, 393–4.

Arnold, Matthew, his Essays reviewed, 401–5.

Bible, Modern Correctors of, article on, 119—translators not often men of genius, *ib.*—translation of the Bible difficult, 120—most accurate translations by the Jews, *ib.*—Greek versions and editions, *ib.*—Septuagint most correct, 121—of the Latin, the new Vulgate the best, 122 *et seq.*—no authority for new translation, *ib.*—King James' translation, *ib.*—criticisms on different translations, 126 *et seq.*—Final Committee not final, *ib.*

Banking System, United States, Past and Present, article on, 51—paper currency, *ib.*—banks and branches, *ib.*—circulation, *ib.*—New York state paper, 52—resolution of Congress, A. D. 1832, 53—history of bank circulation, 54—United States Bank established, *ib.*—bank issues, 55—fluctuations of paper currency, *ib.*—bank note circulation, 56—convulsions of New York and other State 57—banks, suspension of payment, *ib.*—banks not the sole cause of busines catastrophes, 60—the true measure of value, *ib.*—actual expenditure in 1862, *ib.*—effect of the war, *ib.*—conditions upon which the banks would give relief, 64—amount of capital necessary, 67—corporate powers granted, *ib.*—boards of directors, *ib.*—rate of interest and discount, 69—associations in nineteen cities, *ib.*—quarterly reports, *ib.*—expense of printing, *ib.*—shares taxable, 70—associations failing, *ib.*—depositories of public money, *ib.*—First National Bank, 72—aggregate capital, *ib.*—number of nationa banks, *ib.*—the system born of the rebellion, *ib.*

Bar, New York, Charles O'Conor, 73—legal profession worthy of honor, *ib.*—study of, 74—Demosthenes and Cicero regarded as members of the bar, *ib.*—jurisprudence suffers like other sciences, *ib.*—France next to Rome in the legal profession, 75—the law language of England, *ib.*—the Gauls rank first in jurisprudence, 76—lawyers required to be courteous, 77—O'Conor not a politician, 78—sketch of his life, 79 *et seq.*—first appearance in law reports, 84—greatest cases, 86–7—the California quicksilver mine, 87—arguments against the negro, 88—greatest merits as an orator, 89, *et seq.*

Comptroller's Report reviewed, 417, 418.

Criminals, American female, article on, 268—American treatment of women, *ib.*—women in primitive state, 269—influence of German and Gallic women, *ib.*—Ancient Britons' usage of women, 270—consulted women on national questions, *ib.*—as civilization advances, "woman's rights" fall into disuse, *ib.*—women sign charters, *ib.*—and sit in parliament, 271—privileges of abbesses, *ib.*—influence of Alice Perrers, *ib.*—writ of Edward III., 272—offices filled by women, 273—John Knox opposes woman's rights, 274—women have a voice in parliament, *ib.*—privileges of peeresses, 275—ladies in the House of Commons, 276—Lord Shaftesbury denounces them 277—Victoria as a sovereign, *ib.*—them French Republicans represent woman as their idol, *ib.*—treat her without mercy, 279 *et seq.*—Jews, Greeks, and Romans punish woman as man, 280—female criminals of different countries, 280 *et seq.*—false gallantry in France, *ib.*—increased crime, 281—Louis XIV. impartial, 281–4—case of Madame Tiquet, *ib.*—case of Nannette, 286—her confession, 287 *et seq.*—salutary effect of her execution, *ib.*—deathblow to false gallantry in Spain, *ib.*—case of Mendieta, 288–91—Madame Gottfried, 291—her confession, *ib.*—justice made a farce of by our jurymen, 296 *et seq.*—woman found guilty, as man, should suffer equally, *ib.*—respect due only to the virtuous and good, 279.

Cicero, negative character of, article on, 297—character the sum total of the man, 298—old Roman character viewed as forming a

certain national type, 299—it revealed no negatives, *ib.*—Rome the pioneer of modern civilization, *ib.*—Marius a type of the lowest grade of Roman character, *ib.*—character of Cicero marked strongly by Celtic traits, 301—this has helped to develop his real character, *ib.*—his letters convict him of vanity and the weaker passions, 302— in morality he stands higher than his contemporaries, *ib.*—in youth he was undecided till selfishness ruled, *ib.*—in his prime he was equally wavering, *ib.*—in advanced life still irresolute, 304—wept for his country, *ib* —acted as mediator between the factions, *ib.*—can be justly viewed only from his own standpoint, 305—Cæsar tries to entice him, 306—he lacks faith in Pompey, 307—his deficiencies arose for want of a high principle, 308—compared with Cæsar and Pompey, *ib.*—both positive characters, 309 *et seq.*—neither could tolerate a rival, 310.—Pompey feared the trouble of ruling, *ib.*—Cicero's centre was his vanity, 314—three distinct views of the world, *ib.*—first thought on returning from exile, 315—his letters show his private life, 320 *et seq.*—distinguished for what he was not than what he was, 321.

Commencements of Colleges, &c., article on, 366—criticism, 367—plans of education, 368 *et seq*—study of Latin, 370—translating, 371—too many rules, 372—importance of composition, 373-4 —system of the Jesuits, 374 *et seq*—Bacon's opinion, 375—Georgetown College, 377-380—Holy Cross College, 380-82—Fordham College, 382-4—St. Xavier's, 384—Manhattan College 385-388—Columbia College, 388—Harvard, *ib* —Rockland Female Institute, 389—Deer Park Female Institute—a comparison, 390—St. Mary's Academy—391-2—Ferris Female Institute, 393.

Cape Cod, noticed, 194-5

Druids, The Celtic, article on, 1—unwillingness to enlighten the world, 2—the Druids objected to writing, *ib.*—misrepresented in history, 3—German writers favor the Druids as much as Irish, Welsh, or French, *ib.*—Cæsar's opinion, 5—they do not go to war, *ib.* cultivated memory and diligence, *ib.*—immortality of the soul, 6—astronomy and philosophy taught, *ib.*—Magi and Druids compared, 7—Bards and Eubages inferior to the Druids, *ib.*—the learned men of the age, 8—influence of Bards during civil war, *ib.*—deserve both honor and credit, 9—cruelty of Edward I., *ib.*—Druids repair to the mountains of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, 10—fine specimens of architecture, *ib.*—the groves their temples, *ib.*—sacrilege to use tools on temples to the Deity, 11—the cross a sacred symbol in most countries from earliest records, 12—the oak regarded as a sacred tree, *ib.*—human sacrifices, modes of offering them, *ib.*—eminent writers deny the cruelty of the Druids, 15—their leading maxims, *ib.*—origin of transmigration of souls, 16—different kinds of beasts offered in sacrifice, *ib.*—elevated notions of the soul, 17—malefactors not the innocent sacrificed, *ib.*—modes of despatching their victims for sacrifice, 18—the fairies, 19—the greatest nations offered human sacrifices, *ib.*—the Jews of more modern times, *ib.*—sacrifices to Saturn, 21—instruments and vessels used for sacrifices, 22—a sculpture, *ib.*—a sacrifice in the tenth century, 23—ancient laws of the Druids, 24—most learned and distinguished authors give credit to the Druids, *ib.*—Cæsar eulogizes the Gauls, *ib.*—The Druids did good in their time, 26.

Debt, National, of the United States, article on, 321—our ability to pay been demonstrated, 323—plans to liquidate,' 324—statements on the debt of England, 325—her national debt the cause of war with the colonies, 328—the debt of France injurious to the nation, 329—the cause of the wars of Louis XIII. and XIV., *ib.*—and aided that of Louis XVI., *ib.*—national bonds of France depreciated, *ib.*—she becomes bankrupt, *ib.*—great suffering, 330—the Englishman, or American pays a heavier debt than the Russian, 331 *et seq.*—our resources constitute our wealth, 332—sinking fund of no advantage, *ib.*—means of restraining the national debt, *ib.*—sinking fund considered, *ib.*—raising loans and increasing taxes, *ib. et seq.*—our seven-thirty bonds safe because our resources are great, 337—the national debt a political tie, *ib* —bonds the only basis for currency, 338—uniform national banking currency a bond of union, *ib.*—effect of increase of population and manufactories, *ib.*—payment of the debt by subscription regarded impossible, *ib.*

Homer, Lord Derby's translation of, article on, 205—it requires a poet to translate poetry, *ib.*—other qualifications indispensable, 206-7—Homer superior to all other poets, *ib.*—a thorough knowledge of Greek necessary to understand the Iliad, *ib.*—the laws of nature never stationary, 208—beauty not the same in all lands, *ib.*—language constantly changing, *ib.*—one language powerless to reproduce what is sublime in another, *ib.*—Greek language superior, 209—different translations of Homer, Derby's translation inferior to most others, 210—deficiency in poetic spirit, *ib.*—poets admired most in their own tongues, *ib.*—Homer in all countries and ages, 212—taste the result of unalterable laws, *ib.*—Lord Derby's translation compared to Mumford's and others, 214 *et seq.*—ungallant style of Derby, 216 *et seq.*—Achilles approaching Hector, *ib.*—translation of, *ib.*—the same by Mumford, 218—shield of Achilles, *ib.*—Pope's version of the same, 220—injury to literature by false translations, 222—the Homeric speeches, 226—difference between a poet and one who is not manifested in lamentation of Briseis for Patroclus, 227—war condemned in the Iliad, *ib.*—proof of the fact, 128.

Humboldt, William von, as a comparative philologist, 228—his investigations co-extensive with the globe, 229—his system has rendered him illustrious, *ib.*—study of language, *ib.*—origin and affinity of European languages, 230—his history in three distinct periods, 231—his first view of the study of languages, *ib.*—essay on the basis of the Basque language, *ib.*—corrections and additions to Adelung's article, *ib.*—second step commenced with the Sanscrit, *ib.*—contributions to the Prussian Academy, 233—transformed ideal points to the order and consistency of universal science, *ib.*—his celebrated letter, 234—nature of writing, *ib.*—its relation to language, *ib.*—important dissertations, *ib.*——minor treatises between 1827 and 1829, 236—grand link connecting the sciences with the nature of man *ib.*—origin, definition, and nature of lan-

guage, 237 *et seq.*—Humboldt's answers, *ib.*—man's reflection converted the sounds of nature into significant signs, *ib.*—language neither the product of organization nor the manifestation of emotion, 238—theory of a divine origin no longer a question with Humboldt, *ib.*—speech flows spontaneously, *ib.*—opposes the idea of divine intervention, 239—this energy the totality of man's powers, *ib.*—language is the connecting link between the finite and infinite nature of man, 240—not the work of an individual, *ib.*—apparent contradiction constitutes the peculiarity of language, 241—our ability to speak referred to a universal element, *ib.*—attempts to analyse the process of speech, 242—manner of the action of instinct, *ib.*—speech closely linked with intellect and senses, *ib.*—man represents himself through speech, *ib.*—constitutive elements of speech, *ib.*—affinity and analogy between thought and sound, 244—articulation belongs to the internal as well as external, *ib.*—articulation the connecting link between thought and sound, 245—three distinct modes of designating objects, 248 *et seq.*—remarks on the phenomena of language, 249—every language maintains an individual character, 250—the character of a language variously manifested, *ib.*—poetry and prose the two grand divisions of speech, 251.

Insurance Report. State Superintendent's, reviewed, 412, *et seq.*

Michelant, M. H., his Voyage de Cartier noticed, 395.

Muller, Max, his Lectures reviewed, 169 *et seq.*

National Academy of Design, criticised, 177 *et seq.*

O'Conor, Charles, article on, 73 *et seq.*

Poetry, the, of the Orient, reviewed, 409.

Perry, R. Ross, his poem noticed, 399.

Persians, ancient civilization of, article on, 340—Persia the centre of Asia, *ib.*—greatness of the early Persians, 341—basis of the Persian religion, *ib.*—the dual principle, *ib.*—Persian language, its earliest elements, 344—spirit of the Persian language shows the tone of mind and character. 347—mechanical arts now known, 348—botany among the Persians, *ib.*—they were behind the Hindoos in medical sciences, *ib.*

Queen Anne, Wits of the Reign of, 251—most splendid in the annals of literature, *ib.*—Addison's life, 250, *et seq.*—his Cato criticised, *ib.*—resorts of the wits at this time, 257—Pope, at the age of twenty-one, appears as a poet, *ib.*—rising glory dims the reputation of Addison, 259—sets up a rival court, *ib.*—his associates there, *ib.*—commences his translation in his twenty-fifth year, 260—Pope views Tickell as his rival, *ib.*—a pamphlet appears reflecting on Pope, *ib.*—his triumph complete, *ib.*—he determines to be avenged, *ib.*—the Dunciad, 262—his life in danger, *ib.*—struggle between him and the Dunces, 263—his epistles, satires, and moral essays, *ib.*—the Dunciad concluded, *ib.*—Congreve, a brilliant young wit, 264—his talents acknowledged, *ib.*—his comodies bright and witty, 265—Dean Swift, the greatest wit of the age, *ib.*—character in youth, *ib.*—Secretary to Sir. W. Temple, *ib.*—access to his library the foundation of his greatness, 266—in 1708 he joins the Tories, *ib.*—the Queen and her advisers refuse him a bishopric, *ib.*—his ambition for political power and notoriety, *ib.*—Bolingbroke *ib.*

Revolution, American, Historical View of, reviewed, 183 *et seq.*

Rebellion, Lessons and Results, article on, 157—civil tribunals more judicious than courts martial, 158—object of execution of criminals, *ib.*—martial law subordinate to civil, 158—the assassins, *ib.*—not acording to laws nations to execute the leader of a rebellion, *ib.*—nothing to be gained by executing Davis, 160—his wife justified in assisting him, *ib.*—leading English journals regard the resuscitation of the Union impossible, *ib.*—Lee's manner of surrender entitles him to his liberty, 168—confiscation next to capital punishment, *ib.*—injudicious to deprive the rebel states of their rights, *ib.*—denying the rights of the rebel states would be acknowledging the dissolution of the Union, 169—Slavery abolished forever, *ib.*—all these questions settled—the Union enters on a more glorious career, 169.

Savage, John, his Sybil reviewed and criticised. 405-9.

Smith, Francis O. J., his Grant to aged indigent mothers noticed, 396-7.

Science, medical, ancient, and modern discoveries in article on, 131—a skilful physicians, 132—restrictions placed on human dissections, *ib.*—effect mistaken for cause, *ib.*—ignorance of sound physiology and anatomy, *ib.*—no improvement down to the times of the Ptolemies, *ib.*—dissection the true means of shedding light on disease *ib.*—discoveries of the Alexandrian doctors, 133—noted physicians, *ib.*—system of empiricists led to valuable discoveries, *ib.*—benefits resulting from change in the medical mind, *ib.*—systems of medicine connected with religious superstitions, 134—the Italians gave little attention to medicine, *ib.*—temples dedicated to deities, *ib.*—slaves first practice medicine in Rome, *ib.*—Mahometanism forbade dissection, 137—modern medicines preventive of disease, 152—enlightened sentiment more necessary to the community than drugs, 156, *et seq.*

Statesmanship, English, Phases of, article on, 96—essays, 98—English history, 100—Macaulay and Lewis contrasted, *ib.*—our statesmanship bears a close resemblance to Great Britain, 101—whig aristocracy, *ib.*—tory administration, 102—reform bill, 103—whigs progressive, *ib.*—tories supporters of the royal prerogative, *ib.*—conservatives, 104—prominent leaders of the party, 105—prominent whigs, 106—the five prominent statesmen of England, *ib.*—Lord Castlereagh, 107—emancipation of Roman Catholics, 108—Canning as a statesman, 110—Lord Grenville aspires to the premiership, 111—character of Lord Grey, 112—his failure as a statesman, 113—Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell,

ib.—Peel's administration, *ib. et seq.*—Russell as a debater, *ib.*—his parliamentary talents, 115—Lord Derby not of highest repute as a statesman, 116—Lord Palmerston, 118—his power of inspiring confidence, *ib.*

Trollope, T. A., his History of Florence noticed, 194–5.

Wise, James A., his Address reviewed, 397–9.

Wallenstein, article on, 27—played a conspicuous part in Europe, *ib.*—his career a most brilliant one, *ib.*—was of ancient noble family, 29—early left an orphan, *ib.*—only the coarse and illiterate are beyond the control of feminine influence, 30—campaign in 1617, 31—Europe disturbed by religious disputes, 32—Ferdinand of Austria, 33—his reign opens with war in the Palatinate, *ib.*—he enjoys a momentary peace, *ib.*—resources of the king uncertain, *ib.*—the King of Denmark called to aid the Union princes, 34—Wallenstein proposes to raise an army at his own expense, 35—a powerful ally to Ferdinand, *ib.*—his army increases, *ib.*—he inspires them with zeal, 36—invincible, *ib.*—he scorned divided fame, *ib.*—his army cost him little, *ib.*—was both hated and feared, 37—in 1627 he demands the Duchy of Mecklenburgh, 38—peace concluded at Lubec, 1819, *ib.*—Wallenstein absolute master in Germany, 39—hated by all but his soldiers, *ib.*—Ferdinand relies upon him as the strength of his empire, *ib.*—he orders him to retire, 40—without murmur he leaves the army, 41—lives in pomp and splendor, 42—soon rises in glory, 43—Ferdinand vainly trusts Count Tilly, *ib.*—the Austrians are defeated, 44—Tilly mortally wounded, *ib.*—the Austrian supremacy passing away, *ib.*—Wallenstein refuses to hold the city. Ferdinand gives him chief command, 45—the duke refuses to accept a divided command, *ib.*—he makes his own conditions, *ib.*—he fights a great battle near Lutzen, 46—Gustavus slain, *ib.*—his character, 47—Wallenstein in a new character, 49—Ferdinand commissions Count Galas to supersede Wallenstein, 50—regarded as a traitor, *ib.*—falls by assassination, *ib.*